


GIFT OF



EX LIBRIS



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2008 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

BOOK

OF THE

FOURTH
AMERICAN PEACE CONGRESS

ST. LOUIS

MAY 1, 2, 3, 1913

EDITED BY

WALTER B. STEVENS

EXECUTIVE SECRETARY OF THE CONGRESS

The image shows a page from a manuscript with two lines of text in a cursive script. The paper is aged and discolored. The first line of text is relatively clear, while the second line is heavily obscured by dark, irregular ink smudges and blotches, making it largely illegible.

JX 1932
A5
1913

OFFICERS

HONORARY PRESIDENT, WOODROW WILSON

HONORARY VICE-PRESIDENTS, WILLIAM H. TAFT, ELIHU ROOT

PRESIDENT, RICHARD BARTHOLDT

VICE-PRESIDENTS

CHAMP CLARK OSCAR S. STRAUSS WILLIAM J. BRYAN
THEODORE E. BURTON ANDREW CARNEGIE JOHN W. GRIGGS

CHAIRMEN OF COMMITTEES

JAMES E. SMITH, Executive.	R. H. STOCKTON, Publicity.
ROBERT S. BROOKINGS, Invitations.	F. W. LEHMANN, International Law.
MANLEY O. HUDSON, Program.	MURRAY CARLETON, Commerce and Industry.
A. ROSS HILL, Educational.	MRS. PHILIP N. MOORE, Women's Organizations.
REV. W. J. WILLIAMSON, Religious Institutions.	J. LIONBERGER DAVIS, Auxiliary Reception.
DAN. C. NUGENT, Reception.	A. B. LAMBERT, Entertainment.
MRS. W. E. FISCHER, Women's Reception.	C. L. HILLEARY, Transportation.
GEORGE D. MARKHAM, Music.	
BRECKINRIDGE JONES, Finance.	

EXECUTIVE SECRETARY, WALTER B. STEVENS

GENERAL COMMITTEE

Mrs. Fannie Fern Andrews, Secretary American School Peace League, Boston, Mass.
Joshua L. Bailey, Vice-President American Peace Society, Philadelphia.
Hannah J. Bailey, Peace Department of the National W. C. T. U., Winthrop Centre, Maine.
H. M. Beardsley, Vice-President Missouri Peace Society, Kansas City, Mo.
John Barrett, Director-General Pan-American Union, Washington.
Charles E. Beals, Secretary Chicago Peace Society, Chicago, Ill.
S. P. Brooks, President Baylor University, Waco, Tex.
Dean Charles R. Brown, Yale Divinity School, New Haven, Conn.
A. D. Call, Executive Director American Peace Society, Washington.
Mrs. Josiah Evans Cowles, Chairman Peace Committee of the General Federation of Women's Clubs, Los Angeles, Cal.
Samuel B. Capen, President Massachusetts Peace Society, Boston, Mass.
J. Reuben Clark, Solicitor Department of State, Washington.
William C. Dennis, Washington.
Charles W. Fairbanks, Former Vice-President of the United States, Indianapolis, Ind.
Mrs. J. Malcolm Forbes, Milton, Mass.

James Cardinal Gibbons, Baltimore, Md.
 Thomas E. Green, International Lecturer, Chicago, Ill.
 Edwin Ginn, Vice-President American Peace Society, Boston, Mass.
 Archbishop John J. Glennon, St. Louis, Mo.
 Wilbur F. Gordy, Connecticut Peace Society, Hartford, Conn.
 Charles Noble Gregory, Dean of the George Washington University.
 Herbert S. Hadley, Former Governor of Missouri, Kansas City, Mo.
 Mrs. Charles Henrotin, Former President of the General Federation of Women's Clubs, Chicago, Ill.
 William I. Hull, Pennsylvania Arbitration and Peace Society, Swarthmore, Pa.
 Dean F. P. Keppel, Columbia University, New York City.
 Eugene Levering, President National Bank of Commerce, Baltimore, Md.
 Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Director of the Abraham Lincoln Center, Chicago.
 David Starr Jordan, President Stanford University, California.
 Edward B. Krehbiel, Stanford University, California.
 Louis P. Lochner, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis.
 John Lewis, The Globe, Toronto, Canada.
 H. L. McCune, Kansas City, Mo.
 Henry B. F. Macfarland, Washington.
 Lucia Ames Mead, Chairman Committee on Peace and Arbitration, International Council of Women, Boston, Mass.
 Edwin D. Mead, Vice-President American Peace Society, Boston, Mass.
 Mrs. Percy V. Pennybacker, President of the General Federation of Women's Clubs, Austin, Tex.
 Philip Van Ness Myers, Author, Cincinnati, Ohio.
 H. C. Phillips, Secretary Lake Mohonk Conferences on International Arbitration, Washington.
 Justice William Renwick Riddell, Toronto, Canada.
 George E. Roberts, Washington.
 Robert C. Root, The Peace Society of Northern California, Berkeley, Cal.
 Dean Henry Wade Rogers, Yale University, New Haven, Conn.
 William P. Rogers, Dean Cincinnati Law School, Cincinnati, Ohio.
 Professor P. S. Reinsch, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis.
 Rev. Rodney W. Roundy, Secretary Connecticut Peace Society, Hartford, Conn.
 Justice B. Russell, Halifax, N. S.
 Dr. Ernst Richard, Columbia University, New York City.
 Daniel Smiley, Redlands Peace Society, Redlands, Cal.
 C. H. Spooner, President Norwich University, Northfield, Vt.
 Dr. Benjamin F. Trueblood, Secretary American Peace Society, Washington.
 Charles F. Thwing, President Western Reserve University, Cleveland.
 Rev. A. L. Weatherly, Secretary Nebraska Peace Society, Lincoln, Neb.
 Thomas Raeburn White, Member of the American Society of International Law, Philadelphia, Pa.
 George Grafton Wilson, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.
 James L. Tryon, Secretary Massachusetts Peace Society, Boston, Mass.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
Officers of the Congress.....	2
Message from the President of the United States.....	6
Introductory Notes.....	7
The Peace Movement, 1815-1913, Arthur Deerlin Call.....	11
Poem, "Lay Down Your Arms," Mildred McFaden.....	14
A Foreword on The Program, Prof. Manley O. Hudson.....	16
The Program.....	17
Intercollegiate Peace Association, Prof. Stephen F. Weston.....	26
PRELIMINARY MEETINGS.....	28
MISSOURI ORATORICAL CONTEST.....	28
G. C. Wilson: <i>They, Too, Are Brothers</i>	28
Sidney Poage Dalton: <i>The Demand for International Peace</i>	33
John Leo Tierney: <i>International Peace</i>	37
Arnold J. Tuchschildt: <i>Justice and Honor of Nations</i>	44
Edward Vernon Nash: <i>Our Relation to Peace</i>	49
Frank R. Birkhead: <i>War, the Sum of Wretchedness</i>	55
ST. LOUIS UNIVERSITY PEACE SERVICES.....	62
Archbishop John J. Glennon: <i>The Gospel of Peace</i>	63
AMERICAN SCHOOL PEACE LEAGUE, MEETING FOR TEACHERS.....	68
President Charles F. Thwing: <i>Education for Rational Internationalism</i>	69
Mrs. Fannie Fern Andrews: <i>Organization Work for International Peace in Public Schools</i>	73
THE CONGRESS.....	81
FIRST GENERAL SESSION.....	81
Bishop Daniel S. Tuttle: <i>The Invocation</i>	83
Governor Elliott W. Major: <i>Welcome to the State</i>	84
Mayor Henry W. Kiel: <i>Welcome to the City of St. Louis</i>	87
Andrew Carnegie: <i>The Baseless Fear of War</i>	88
Richard Bartholdt: <i>President's Address</i>	101
Benjamin F. Trueblood: <i>The Present Demands of the Peace Movement</i>	106
CONFERENCE ON ORGANIZATION.....	114
Charles E. Beals: <i>Some Experiences in Enlisting Clubs and Other Organizations in Peace Work</i>	114
Arthur Deerlin Call: <i>Facts Relating to the Field</i>	116
Professor William I. Hull: <i>An Efficient State Peace Society</i>	125
Dr. J. J. Hall: <i>Enlargement of Membership in Our Peace Societies</i>	131
Secretary Robert C. Root: <i>Effective Follow-up Work</i>	137
INTER-AMERICAN RELATIONS.....	159
Senor Don Ignacio Calderon: <i>Our International Opportunity</i>	160
Senor Don Frederico Alfonso Pezet: <i>Mutual Confidence and Respect as a Basis for Peace Between Nations</i>	164
J. E. Lefevre: <i>The Isthmus</i>	169
Charles E. Beals: <i>From Jungleism to Internationalism</i>	172
R. L. Borden: <i>Canada's Message</i>	195
L. D. Kingsland: <i>Greetings from Guatemala</i>	196
THE UNIVERSITIES AND THE PEACE MOVEMENT.....	197
Louis P. Lochner: <i>Internationalism Among Universities</i>	197
Mrs. Fannie Fern Andrews: <i>Progress of the Peace Movement Through Education</i>	207
A SYMPOSIUM ON DISARMAMENT.....	214
Philip Van Ness Myer: <i>The New Conscience</i>	214
Jenkin Lloyd Jones: <i>The Three Steps of Disarmament</i>	218
William D. B. Alney: <i>Intellectual and Moral Disarmament</i>	228
Arthur Henry Dadman: <i>The Navy League</i>	234
INTERSTATE ORATORICAL CONTEST.....	248
Vernon M. Welsh: <i>The Assurance of Peace</i>	249
D. L. Wickens: <i>The New Patriotism</i>	254
John Leo Tierney: <i>International Peace</i>	261
J. Arthur Debarleben: <i>America's Obligation</i>	262
Walter John Sherman: <i>The New Nobility</i>	266
Lewis J. Stuckey: <i>From Chaos to Harmony</i>	271

	PAGE
RECEPTION AT THE WEDNESDAY CLUB.....	277
SECOND GENERAL SESSION, THE INEVITABILITY OF PEACE.....	279
Hon. Charles W. Fairbanks: <i>Our National Duty</i>	281
Miss Laura Drake Gill: <i>Some Racial Bearings of War</i>	291
Jenkin Lloyd Jones: <i>Peace, not War, the School of Heroism</i>	296
Booker T. Washington: <i>Education and International Peace</i>	309
THIRD GENERAL SESSION, THE PROBLEM OF HAGUE CONFERENCE.....	314
Professor William I. Hull: <i>The Hague Tribunal, Its Present Meaning and Future Promise</i>	315
Professor Paul S. Reinsch: <i>The Active Promotion of Industrial Peace as a Primary Policy of the United States</i>	333
THE MISSOURI PEACE SOCIETY, SECOND ANNUAL MEETING.....	350
Arthur Deerin Call: <i>The Work of a State Peace Society</i>	350
Manley O. Hudson: <i>Report of the Secretary</i>	354
AUTOMOBILE TOUR AND GARDEN PARTY.....	364
FOURTH GENERAL SESSION, IMMEDIATE ISSUES AND FUTURE AIMS.....	365
Dean Shaller Mathews: <i>Christianity and World Peace</i>	366
Mrs. Lucia Ames Mead: <i>Immediate Issues and Public Sentiment</i>	373
Rev. John Wesley Hill: <i>The Outlook—The United States and Japan</i>	379
Hon. Philander P. Claxton: <i>The Better Way</i>	387
MASS MEETING, YOUNG PEOPLE'S CHRISTIAN FEDERATION.....	397
Dr. David Starr Jordan: <i>Manhood and War</i>	400
Professor Jay William Hudson: <i>The Ethics of War</i>	410
FIFTH GENERAL SESSION, A CENTURY OF ANGLO-AMERICAN PEACE.....	416
Hon. Benjamin Russell: <i>Anglo-American Obligations in Maintaining Peace</i>	417
John Lewis: <i>The Identity of Interests of the United States and Canada</i>	425
PLATFORM OF THE FOURTH AMERICAN PEACE CONGRESS.....	439
Mr. Justice William Renwick Riddell: <i>One Hundred Years Ago</i>	443
Dr. James L. Tryon: <i>One Hundred Years of Peace</i>	458
INTERNATIONAL PEACE THROUGH INTERNATIONAL LAW.....	461
Professor Roland G. Usher: <i>International Law of Airships</i>	461
THE MILITARIST CHALLENGE.....	464
Dr. William P. Rogers: <i>Militarism and the Average Citizen</i>	464
Professor Ernst Richard: <i>How Can We Show Our Good Faith in the Peace Movement</i>	476
Mrs. Elmer Black: <i>Democracy and Peace</i>	485
Senor Alonso Mariscal: <i>Greetings from Mexico</i>	490
SCIENCE AND INTERNATIONAL PEACE.....	494
Professor Maurice Parmelee: <i>Ethnic Factors in International Relations</i>	495
THE RELATIONS OF BUSINESS AND INTERNATIONAL PEACE.....	506
Robert C. Root: <i>The Mills of Industry on the Trail of Mars</i>	507
Eugene Levering: <i>How War Affects Business</i>	516
Jacob G. Schmidlapp: <i>International Credit and War</i>	522
EIGHTY-FIFTH ANNUAL MEETING OF THE AMERICAN PEACE SOCIETY.....	527
Theodore E. Burton: <i>Opening Address</i>	527
S. C. Mitchell: <i>The Demand for Peace</i>	533
SIXTH GENERAL SESSION, THE OUTLOOK FOR PEACE THROUGH-OUT THE WORLD.....	544
Federico Alfonso Pezet: <i>Mutual Confidence and Respect as a Basis for Peace Between Nations</i>	545
Thomas E. Green: <i>The Burden of the Nations</i>	545
Mrs. Percy V. Pennybacker: <i>Peace Pageants</i>	566
David Starr Jordan: <i>Appreciation of the Waste of War</i>	571
German-American Mass Meeting.....	579
Committees of the Congress.....	580
Enrolled Delegates.....	586
Index.....	636

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON


May 19, 1913

My dear Mr. Hudson:

May I not express my very profound interest in the objects of the Fourth American Peace Congress? The best thought, as well as the best principle of the world, is now being devoted to making peace practicable and universal by a thorough study of the conditions which determine the dealings of nations with one another and also of the means by which misunderstandings may be cleared away and all troublesome questions settled upon a basis of amity and justice, and congresses such as this play a large part in the great process.

Cordially and sincerely yours,

Mr. Manley O. Hudson,
St. Louis, Missouri.

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read "Woodrow Wilson", with a long, sweeping flourish extending from the bottom right.

INTRODUCTORY NOTE

Internationalism passed a milestone at St. Louis in the first three days of May, 1913.

The Middle West has been an intensely, not to say a blindly loyal, section of the country. In its view, the Government could do no wrong. Here, through generations of stalwart young manhood, the recruiting officer of army and navy has found an encouraging field for solicitation.

But hither in May came the apostles of Universal Peace. They gathered from the Atlantic and Pacific coasts, from the Gulf states, from the Great Lakes region. They presented amazing figures of the cost of war. They showed that present-day militarism is a heavier handicap than actual fighting, upon civilization. They marshaled in impressive but depressing array the millions of men now under arms. To the immediate and crushing expense of maintenance they added the indirect loss suffered through the withdrawal of these legions from the productive forces of the world. In vivid words the horrors of war were depicted. Beside these pictures in sharp contrast were sketched the beneficial uses to which the wasted billions of money might be put. It was startling; it was fascinating; it was masterly; it was convincing.

To the Fourth American Peace Congress came men who had filled or are still holding positions of high rank in the Executive, the Legislative and the Judicial Departments of the Government. They spoke with authority for Peace, World Wide Peace, from actual personal knowledge of existing conditions of present-day problems. They were unsparing in their condemnation of the militaristic policies. They

forecasted vividly the disastrous climax to which these policies are tending.

Heads of peace societies, of arbitration leagues, of international unions, representatives of two scores of organized bodies consecrated to the cause, set forth the phases of the movement from widely varied points of view. They dealt in figures which were shocking. They expounded the law in its evolution from the relations of individuals to those of nations. They asserted astounding statements of fact. They raised standards of high ideals. In sentences which burned they upheld moral sentiment. They gave practical emphasis to the brotherhood of man. But they were not intolerant, they opened the door wide to discussion and listened to those who argued for "adequate" defense.

The President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, Justices of the Supreme Court, Ambassadors of the United States to other countries, Members of Congress, Governors of states and Mayors of cities manifested their sympathetic interest in letters of well-wishing.

The Prime Minister of Canada, the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Mexico, the Governments of Central and South American Republics recognized officially that this was truly an "American Peace Congress." Among the most notable addresses were those of Canadians and of Latin-Americans.

With the new Republic of China were exchanged telegrams of congratulation.

From the British Commission in charge of the centennial celebration of peace between English-speaking peoples came messages of heartiest good will.

Thirty states, fifty cities, federations of women's clubs generally, universities, commercial bodies, church organizations without number were represented by delegates.

Six general sessions and ten section meetings heard the fifty addresses from the speakers of national and international fame. Two intercollegiate contests brought together the student orators who had won in college or state competition. A mass meeting of young people presided over by Andrew Carnegie turned hundreds from the doors.

The annual assemblages of the American Peace Society and of the Missouri Peace Society were incidental features of interest.

Preliminary to the formal opening of the Congress were peace exercises in the colleges and schools, the discourse of Archbishop John J. Glennon before the student body of St. Louis University, the mass meeting of the American School Peace League, the dedication of the Jefferson Memorial.

The recreation hours of the Congress were planned in no perfunctory spirit. Here was an assemblage of earnest, high-minded men and women, most of them strangers to each other. Possibly the easiest way of entertaining would have been with the usual dinner or banquet. But the unusual conditions were taken into consideration. Features which were not ordinary were provided. That which St. Louis had to offer in distinction from any other city was tendered. Thereby the genius of doing the right thing for the right kind of people was demonstrated. On the opening day was given a reception at the Wednesday Club. It was a get-acquainted reception carried out with the graciousness of St. Louis' foremost women. It gave the delegates from all parts of the nation coveted opportunity to meet personally the leaders in the peace movement. The second afternoon was divided into two parts, both of keen enjoyment. Citizens came with their motors and personally conducted the delegates and visitors on a tour of the city. They gave them a comprehensive view of homes, of private residence places, of parks, of educational

institutions. The garden party at Shaw's Garden completed this discovery of St. Louis. Thus upon the reception and entertainment of delegates was bestowed that personal touch which has made the city's brand of hospitality renowned.

In the words of one of the national leaders, the Fourth American Peace Congress "was a great occasion, a great contribution to civilization, a great success, and its importance will be appreciated more and more as the peace movement hastens on to its consummation."

W. B. S.

THE PEACE MOVEMENT, 1815-1913

MR. ARTHUR DEERIN CALL, Director American Peace Society.

War is costly. It is costly in terms of dollars and cents. The world is spending directly on the heathenish, savage and malignant institution of war two billions of dollars each year and indirectly two billions more. If we had this four billion dollars at our disposal we could build ten Panama Canals every year, and have money left over. In our own country, in a time of profound peace, at least seventy out of every hundred dollars which we raise for the maintenance of our government is spent because of war. A forward-looking people will not submit to such a situation indefinitely. Everybody recognizes the desolating, horrible effects of this great delusion which we call war, taking not only money but people out of the productive activities of life, keeping twenty million men of the world under arms.

In 1915 it will be one hundred years since organized peace agencies began, for it was back in 1815 in the home of one of New York's most illustrious merchants, David Lowe Dodge, that a little group of people organized the world's first Peace Society. The same year the Massachusetts Peace Society was organized. Out of these grew the American Peace Society in 1828 and the impressive peace propaganda of the middle part of the last century. This attempt on the part of the world to abolish war expressed itself not only in the organization of many peace societies here and abroad, but in a mighty popular uprising, crystallizing in great international peace congresses, the first of which, initiated by the American Peace Society, met in London in 1843. Other international peace congresses were held at Brussels in 1848, at Paris in 1849, at Frankfort in 1850 and in London in 1851. Some leading persons connected with these congresses were Hugo, Cobden, Bright, and Burritt. These important congresses represented a genuine opposition to all that accompanies the institutions of militarism.

After a generation of wars when peace societies and peace propaganda were less in evidence, the year 1871 found the sentiment for peace again regnant and decisive. During that year many peace jubilees were held throughout the United States. Two years later the International Law Association was organized for the purpose of promoting peace through law. Pan-American congresses began in 1889 for the purpose of promoting peace between the American Republics. The same year the Interparliamentary Union was formed, made up today of over three thousand members, actual government representatives, all actively interested in doing away with this archaic institution of savagery. Other hopeful agencies of our time may be mentioned as The International Peace Bureau founded at Berne, Switzerland, 1891; The Mohonk Arbitration Conference begun in 1895; The American Society of International Law formed in 1906; the Intercollegiate Peace Association started in 1905; the Association for International Conciliation with branches in several countries issuing regularly important utterances in favor of international peace since 1907; the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace founded in 1910.

It is of no small significance that there are eighty peace societies in the United States today; that there are over six hundred peace societies in the world; that there have been since the beginning of the eighteenth century over three hundred important international arbitrations, no one of which has failed of its purpose, no one of which has ever needed the army or navy to enforce its provisions.

Then, of course, there are the two great Hague Conferences. The first convened May 18, 1899, with the representatives of twenty-six nations gathered for the purpose of finding a way, if possible, out of the strange and anomalous condition in which the nations found themselves. Out of that first Hague Conference grew the International Arbitration Tribunal, which is essentially a court, a court which has already settled twelve acute international difficulties, any one of which might have led to war. While there were twenty-six nations represented at the first Hague Conference, there were represented at the second Hague Conference in 1907 forty-four

nations, practically all of the nations of the world. These conferences occurring periodically constitute hopefully the beginnings of our legislative body of the nations, while our International Arbitration Tribunal, our International Court of Prize, and our Supreme Court of the nations are the organizations representing the genesis of an international judiciary. It does not seem an undue stretch of the imagination to call such machinery a most practical basis for our ultimate substitute for international wars.

In 1915 we are to have the third Hague Conference. The Peace Congress held at St. Louis, May 1, 2 and 3, was America's chance to forecast the next steps toward this, the world's most important reform, and, as the following pages show, it did not ignore its opportunity. But the significant fact about this congress was the congress itself. All friends of international peace are gratified that the great Central West of the United States has felt the peace movement as never before. The influence of the meetings, while immeasurable, was very great. This volume of their proceedings will carry their message to other men and women throughout the world, and help appreciably the oncoming time when there shall be no more international wars.

LAY DOWN YOUR ARMS

(Woman's Plea for Peace, written for the Fourth American Peace Congress by Mildred McFaden.)

I.

Lay down your arms: refuse to longer wear
The cursed mark of Cain upon your brow;
O, realize that men are brothers now,
That Love, not Hate, the victor's palm shall bear.
No longer strive to conquer to ensnare,—
By brutal force bid weaker peoples bow
The neck to galling yoke; instead, allow
All equal right in Life's great good to share.
O, pride, and pomp, and power, and lace of gold,
O, panoply of war, O, shot and shell,
No language do you speak save that of Hell!
None else could voice the cruel story told.
Forsake the evil: humankind it harms,
Lay down your arms, in peace, lay down your arms!

II.

Lay down your arms: the soul of war is dead—
That sense of chivalry, that daring bold
Which led crusade and pilgrimage of old—
When valiant knight on field of honor bled
And romance o'er their deeds its glamour shed.
But modern warfare speaks in figures cold,
In strength of armaments, in terms of gold,
And writes its ghastly tale in carnage red!
Let nations all agree to arbitrate
And stop the precious toll of human life—
The flower of our youth—prevent the strife;
Before a gun is fired, capitulate:
Since peace through arbitration must be wrought,
O, make it first instead of last resort.

III.

Lay down your arms: each agonizing cry
That rises from the trench in death-struck woe,
Strikes womankind with even fiercer blow—
And mothers broken-hearted, question why,
If war is right, and men like dogs must die,
Why through the shadow of death's valley go,
In pain and travail only they can know,
To bear and nurture sons for slaughter—why?

But woman's hour has struck: her soul demands
 That war shall cease: and who hath better right
 To blot from earth the crime, the curse, the blight,
 To wash accusing stains from human hands!
 The goal she sees is free from war's alarms,
 The Brotherhood of Man: lay down your arms!

IV.

Lay down your arms: the time long-promised, nears—
 In vision seen by prophet-seers of old—
 The end of war in all the earth foretold—
 When men shall beat to pruning-hooks their spears,
 And swords to plowshares knowing hence no fears;
 When wolf and lamb together in one fold
 Shall feed—for none shall hurt or kill—behold,
 “A little child shall lead them.” Love appears!
 Then let our armies and our navies learn
 The arts of peace, and make the deserts bloom;
 In reaper's song forget the cannon's boom,
 And battle-ships to trading-ships will turn.
 Peace, world-wide peace, with all its blessed charms—
 Is woman's plea today: Lay down your arms!

FOREWORD

MANLEY O. HUDSON, Chairman Program Committee.

The program of the Fourth American Peace Congress was framed with a view to creating more general popular support of the Peace Movement. The pacifist is indeed an idealist, but his idealism must not seem impractical to the average man if the demands of the Peace Movement are to find permanent place in governmental policies. Hence the desire that the addresses and proceedings of the Congress should appeal to an extensive public with whom prevailing military ideals might give way to faith in mankind as a brotherhood. This appeal could not be disassociated from present international problems. The time affords abundant opportunity for the exercise of rationalism in adjusting international differences and for proving its efficacy superior to force. The demands of international justice in existing situations commanded the attention of many speakers at the Congress. Some effort was made, also, to present scholarly analyses of the background of war and of the forces postponing the universal application in international affairs of standards never questioned intranationally. It is hoped that some addition has been made to the thought and literature of the Peace Movement, and that the Congress has achieved a broader acceptance of the gospel of rational internationalism.

PROGRAM

PRELIMINARY TO THE CONGRESS

Sunday, April 27

- 11 A. M. Notices of the Congress will be read from all pulpits in the Central West.

Tuesday, April 29

- 8 P. M. THE MISSOURI ORATORICAL CONTEST OF THE INTER-COLLEGIATE PEACE ASSOCIATION.

Sheldon Memorial Auditorium.

Presiding, HON. SELDEN P. SPENCER.

Judges: MR. ASHLEY CABELL, MR. E. M. GROSSMAN,
MR. EDWARD HIDDEN.

1. "Our Relation to Peace," MR. EDWARD VERNON NASH, Central College.
2. "International Peace," MR. JOHN LEO TIERNEY, St. Louis University.
3. "They, Too, Are Brothers," MR. GEORGE C. WILLSON, University of Missouri.
4. "The Justice and Honor of Nations," MR. ARNOLD J. TUCHSCHMIDT, Washington University.
5. "The Demand for International Peace," MR. SIDNA POAGE DALTON, Westminster College.
6. "War, The Sum of Wretchedness," MR. FRANK R. BIRKHEAD, William Jewell College.

First Prize \$75—Intercollegiate Peace Association.

Second Prize \$50—Fourth American Peace Congress.

Wednesday, April 30

- 9 A. M. PEACE EXERCISES in all High Schools, Colleges and Universities of St. Louis and Missouri.
- 9 A. M. SOLEMN HIGH MASS. College Church, St. Louis University.
Discourse: THE MOST REVEREND JOHN J. GLENNON, Archbishop of St. Louis.
- 2 P. M. THE DEDICATION OF THE JEFFERSON MEMORIAL, Forest Park, St. Louis.

8 P. M. MEETING OF THE AMERICAN SCHOOL PEACE LEAGUE.

Soldan High School.

Presiding, MR. BEN BLEWETT, Superintendent of the St. Louis Public Schools.

"Education for Rational Internationalism"—PRESIDENT CHARLES F. THWING, Western Reserve University.

"The Organization of Work for International Peace in the Public Schools"—MRS. FANNIE FERN ANDREWS, Secretary of the American School Peace League.

8 P. M. ONE HUNDRED YEARS OF PEACE.

McKinley High School.

Presiding, MR. ARMAND R. MILLER, Assistant Principal of the McKinley High School.

Illustrated Stereopticon Lecture—MR. JAMES L. TRYON, Director, New England Department of the American Peace Society.

THE CONGRESS

Thursday Morning, May 1

9 A. M. REGISTRATION OF DELEGATES at the Odeon, the headquarters of the Congress.

10 A. M. THE OPENING SESSION.

The Odeon.

Presiding, HON. RICHARD BARTHOLDT, President of the Congress.

Called to Order by Mr. JAMES E. SMITH, Chairman of the Executive Committee.

Invocation—RIGHT REVEREND DANIEL S. TUTTLE, Bishop of the Diocese of Missouri.

Addresses of Welcome:

HON. E. W. MAJOR, Governor of Missouri.

HON. HENRY W. KIEL, Mayor of St. Louis.

Address: "The Baseless Fear of War"—MR. ANDREW CARNEGIE.

President's Address—HON. RICHARD BARTHOLDT.

Address: "The Present Demands of the Peace Movement"—MR. BENJAMIN F. TRUEBLOOD, Secretary of the American Peace Society.

Thursday Afternoon, May 1

2 P. M. CONFERENCE ON ORGANIZATION FOR THE PROMOTION OF INTERNATIONAL PEACE.

Section Meeting. Odeon Recital Hall.

Presiding, MR. ARTHUR DEERIN CALL, Executive Director of the American Peace Society.

"Facts Relating to the Field"—MR. ARTHUR DEERIN CALL.

"Some Experiences in Enlisting Clubs and Other Organizations for Peace Work"—MR. CHARLES E. BEALS, Secretary, Chicago Peace Society.

"An Efficient State Peace Society"—PROFESSOR WILLIAM I. HULL, Secretary, Pennsylvania Arbitration and Peace Society.

"The Enlargement of Membership in our Peace Societies"—MR. J. J. HALL, Secretary, Georgia Peace Society.

"An Effective Follow-Up Work after the Peace Society Has Been Organized"—MR. ROBERT C. ROOT, Secretary, California Peace Societies.

Discussion led by:

MR. A. B. HUMPHREY, Secretary, American Peace and Arbitration League.

MR. JOHN WESLEY HILL, President, International Peace Forum.

MR. WILLIAM H. SHORT, Secretary, New York Peace Society.

MRS. J. E. COWLES, Peace Committee Chairman, General Federation of Women's Clubs.

MR. ARTHUR L. WEATHERLEY, Secretary, Nebraska Peace Society.

MR. HARRY E. HUNT, President, Great Lakes International Arbitration Society.

2 P. M. INTER-AMERICAN RELATIONS.

Section Meeting. St. Louis University Auditorium.

Presiding, HON. RICHARD BARTHOLDT, President of the Congress.

"Our International Opportunity"—SENOR DON IGNACIO CALDERON, Minister of Bolivia to the United States.

"Mutual Confidence and Respect as a Basis for Peace between Nations"—MR. FREDERICO ALFONSO PEZET, Minister of Peru to the United States.

"The Isthmus"—MR. J. LEFEVRE, Charge d'Affaires, Panama Legation.

"From Junglism to Internationalism"—MR. CHARLES E. BEALS, Director, Central-West Department, American Peace Society.

Discussion—Ministers of other American Republics.

2 P. M. THE UNIVERSITIES AND THE PEACE MOVEMENT.

Section Meeting. Sheldon Memorial Auditorium.

Presiding, DEAN ISIDOR LOEB, University of Missouri.

"Internationalism Among Universities"—MR. LOUIS P. LOCHNER, General Secretary, The Association of Cosmopolitan Clubs.

"The Progress of the Peace Movement Through Education"—MRS. FANNIE FERN ANDREWS, Secretary, The American School Peace League.

"International Patriotism Among College Students"—PRESIDENT CHARLES F. THWING, Western Reserve University.

Discussion led by:

PRESIDENT S. C. MITCHELL, University of South Carolina.

PRESIDENT FRANK L. McVEY, University of North Dakota.

PROFESSOR S. F. WESTON, Antioch College.

MISS VIDA HUNT FRANCIS, Secretary, Association of Collegiate Alumnae.

2 P. M. A SYMPOSIUM ON DISARMAMENT.

Section Meeting. Odeon.

Presiding, PROFESSOR ROLAND G. USHER, Washington University.

General Discussion:

MR. PHILIP VAN NESS MYERS.

HON. WILLIAM D. B. AINEY.

MR. JENKIN LLOYD JONES.

4 P. M. INTERSTATE ORATORICAL CONTEST OF THE INTER-COLLEGIATE PEACE ASSOCIATION.

Third Baptist Church Auditorium.

Presiding, PRESIDENT CHARLES F. THWING, Western Reserve University, President of the Intercollegiate Peace Association.

Contestants:

MR. VERNON M. WELSH, Knox College, Illinois.

MR. D. L. WICKENS, Morningside College, Iowa.

MR. JOHN LEO TIERNEY, St. Louis University, Missouri.

MR. J. ARTHUR DEBARDLEBEN, Nebraska Wesleyan University, Nebraska.

MR. W. J. SHERMAN, Dakota Wesleyan University, South Dakota.

MR. LEWIS M. STUCKEY, Southwestern University, Texas.

Prize, \$100—Fourth American Peace Congress.

4 P. M. RECEPTION tendered by the Wednesday Club to the Officers, Speakers, and Visiting Delegates to the Congress.

Wednesday Club, Taylor Avenue and Westminster Place.

Thursday Evening, May 1

8 P. M. THE INEVITABILITY OF PEACE.

Second General Session. Odeon.

Presiding, ACTING CHANCELLOR FREDERIC A. HALL,
Washington University.

"Our National Duty"—HON. CHARLES W. FAIRBANKS.

"Some Racial Bearings of War"—MISS LAURA DRAKE GILL,
President, The College for Women, Sewanee, Tennessee.

"Peace, Not War, the School of Heroism"—MR. JENKIN LLOYD
JONES, Director, Abraham Lincoln Center, Chicago.

"Education and International Peace"—MR. BOOKER T. WASH-
INGTON, Principal of Tuskegee Institute.

Friday Morning, May 2

10 A. M. THE PROBLEMS OF THE HAGUE CONFERENCE.

Third General Session. Odeon.

Presiding, MR. JAMES BROWN SCOTT, Secretary, Carnegie
Endowment for International Peace.

"The Hague Tribunal, Its Present Meaning and Future
Promise"—PROFESSOR WILLIAM I. HULL, Swarthmore
College.

"The Active Promotion of International Peace as a Primary
Policy of the United States"—PROFESSOR PAUL S. REINSCH,
University of Wisconsin.

"The Pan-Teutonic Pledge of Peace"—MR. EDWIN D. MEAD,
Director, World Peace Foundation.

Friday Afternoon, May 2

2 P. M. SECOND ANNUAL MEETING OF THE MISSOURI PEACE SOCIETY.

Jefferson Hotel, Committee Room.

HON. RICHARD BARTHOLDT, President.

Reports of Officers.

Election of Officers.

Address: "The Work of a State Peace Society"—MR. ARTHUR
DEEBIN CALL, Executive Director, American Peace Society.

3 P. M. AUTOMOBILE TOUR OF ST. LOUIS for the Visiting Dele- gates, starting from the Jefferson Hotel.

4 P. M. RECEPTION by the Executive Committee to the Officers and Speakers and Delegates, at the Missouri Botanical Garden (Shaw's Garden). By the courtesy of the Trustees and the Director of the Missouri Botanical Garden.

Friday Evening, May 2

8 P. M. IMMEDIATE ISSUES AND FUTURE AIMS.

Fourth General Session. Odeon.

Presiding, HON. CHARLES W. FAIRBANKS.

"Christianity and World Peace"—DEAN SHAILER MATHEWS, University of Chicago Divinity School, President, Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America.

"The Immediate Issue"—MRS. LUCIA AMES MEAD, Chairman, Peace and Arbitration Committee, National Council of Women.

"The Outlook for Peace—the United States and Japan"—MR. JOHN WESLEY HILL, President International Peace Forum.

"The Better Way"—HON. PHILANDER P. CLAXTON, United States Commissioner of Education.

8 P. M. YOUNG PEOPLE'S MASS MEETING.

Third Baptist Church Auditorium.

Presiding, MR. ANDREW CARNEGIE.

"Manhood and War"—PRESIDENT DAVID STARR JORDAN, Leland Stanford, Jr., University.

"The Ethics of War"—PROFESSOR JAY WILLIAM HUDSON, University of Missouri.

8 P. M. ONE HUNDRED YEARS OF PEACE.

Sumner High School.

Presiding, MR. FRANK L. WILLIAMS, Principal of the Sumner High School.

Illustrated Stereopticon Lecture—MR. JAMES L. TRYON, Director, New England Department of the American Peace Society.

Saturday Morning, May 3

10 A. M. A CENTURY OF ANGLO-AMERICAN PEACE.

Fifth General Session. Odeon.

Presiding, HON. THEODORE E. BURTON, United States Senator from Ohio.

"Anglo-American Obligations in Maintaining Peace"—HON. BENJAMIN RUSSELL, Justice, Supreme Court of Nova Scotia.
MR. ANDREW B. HUMPHREY, Secretary of the American Committee on the Celebration of One Hundred Years of Peace Between English Speaking Peoples.

"The Identity of the Interests of the United States and Canada"—MR. JOHN LEWIS, Editor, The Toronto Star.

- 10 A. M. A CENTURY OF ANGLO-AMERICAN PEACE—Continued.
 "One Hundred Years Ago"—HON. WILLIAM RENWICK RIDDELL,
 Associate Justice, Supreme Court of Ontario, Appellate
 Division.
 Report of the Resolutions Committee—DR. BENJAMIN F.
 TRUEBLOOD, Chairman.
 Invitation to the Next Congress—PRESIDENT DAVID STARR
 JORDAN, MR. ROBERT C. ROOT, of California.
 Reading of Letters.
 "One Hundred Years of Peace"—DR. JAMES L. TRYON, Secre-
 tary of the Massachusetts Peace Society. (Illustrated
 Stereopticon Lecture.)

Saturday Afternoon, May 3

- 2 P. M. INTERNATIONAL PEACE THROUGH INTERNATIONAL
 LAW.
 Section Meeting. Sheldon Memorial Library.
 Presiding, PROFESSOR E. C. ELIOT, Washington University.
 "The International Law of Airships"—PROFESSOR ROLAND
 G. USHER, Washington University.
 "Panama Tolls and the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty"—MR. JAMES
 BROWN SCOTT.
 General Discussion.
- 2 P. M. A SYMPOSIUM ON THE MILITARIST CHALLENGE.
 Section Meeting. Sheldon Memorial Auditorium.
 Presiding, MR. BENJAMIN F. TRUEBLOOD, Secretary, the
 American Peace Society.
 "Militarism and the Average Citizen"—DEAN WILLIAM P.
 ROGERS, Cincinnati Law School.
 "How Can We Show Our Good Faith in the Peace Move-
 ment"—PROFESSOR ERNST RICHARD, President, the German-
 American Peace Society, New York.
 "Democracy and Peace"—MRS. ELMER BLACK, Delegate of the
 Church Peace League.
 "Greetings from Mexico"—SEÑOR ALONSO MARISCAL, Delegate
 of the United States of Mexico.
 Discussion led by MR. EDWIN D. MEAD, Director, The World
 Peace Foundation.
- 2 P. M. SCIENCE AND INTERNATIONAL PEACE.
 Section Meeting. Odeon Recital Hall.
 Presiding, PROFESSOR WILLIAM I. HULL, Swarthmore College.
 "Ethnic Factors in International Relations"—PROFESSOR
 MAURICE PARMELEE, University of Missouri.
 "The Effect on International Ideals of the Advance in
 Science"—PRESIDENT DAVID STARR JORDAN, Leland Stanford,
 Jr., University.

2 P. M. THE RELATIONS OF BUSINESS AND INTERNATIONAL PEACE.

Section Meeting. Sheldon Memorial Assembly Hall.
Presiding, MR. LEROY A. GODDARD, President, State Bank of Chicago.

"The Mills of Industry on the Trail of Mars"—MR. ROBERT C. ROOT, Director, Pacific Coast Department American Peace Society.

"How War Affects Business"—MR. EUGENE LEVERING, President, National Bank of Commerce, Baltimore.

"International Credit and War"—MR. JACOB G. SCHMIDLAPP, Union Savings Bank and Trust Company, Cincinnati.

"The Business Man an Advocate of Peace"—HON. JOHN HAYS HAMMOND.

4 P. M. EIGHTY-FIFTH ANNUAL MEETING OF THE AMERICAN PEACE SOCIETY.

Odeon.

Opening Address by the President, SENATOR THEODORE E. BURTON, of Ohio.

Address: "The Demand for Peace"—PRESIDENT S. C. MITCHELL, University of South Carolina.

Business Session—

Reports of Board of Directors and Treasurer.

Election of Officers.

General Discussion of the Work of the Society.

Miscellaneous Business.

Saturday Evening, May 3

8 P. M. THE OUTLOOK FOR PEACE THROUGHOUT THE WORLD.

Sixth General Session. Odeon.

Presiding, HON. RICHARD BARTHOLDT, President of the Congress.

Address—MR. FREDERICO ALFONSO PEZET, Minister of Peru to the United States.

"Peace Pageants"—MRS. PERCY V. PENNYBACKER, President, General Federation of Women's Clubs.

"The Burden of the Nations"—DR. THOMAS E. GREEN, Delegate from Illinois.

"Appreciation of the Waste of War"—PRESIDENT DAVID STARR JORDAN, Leland Stanford, Jr., University.

Sunday, May 4

11 A. M. SERMONS ON INTERNATIONAL PEACE in pulpits of St. Louis and vicinity.

3 P. M. GERMAN-AMERICAN MASS MEETING.

Liederkrantz Club.

Presiding, HON. RICHARD BARTHOLDT.

**"History's Trend Toward Peace"—PROFESSOR ERNST RICHARD,
Columbia University, President of the German-American
Peace Society of New York.**

INTERCOLLEGIATE PEACE ASSOCIATION

PROFESSOR STEPHEN F. WESTON, Secretary.

The first oratorical contest of the Intercollegiate Peace Association was held in 1907, Ohio and Indiana alone participating. At the contest in 1911, in connection with the Third American Peace Congress, seven states participated. Last year eleven states held oratorical contests and this year there are sixteen states participating in these contests. With the increase in the number of states it has been necessary to organize the states into groups. Last year there were two groups and this year they have been organized into three groups. Those who win the first place in the group contests compete in a national contest at Lake Mohonk at the time of the Lake Mohonk Conference. There were three contestants and three prizes at Lake Mohonk this year. The prizes were \$100.00, \$75.00 and \$50.00 and were given by the Misses Seabury. Money prizes are not given in the group contests, but The Business Men's League of St. Louis has kindly offered a first prize of \$100.00 for the contest at St. Louis. The state prizes are usually \$75.00 and \$50.00, but through the generosity of Mrs. Elmer Black they are much larger in New York state.

In organizing the sixteen states into three groups account had to be taken of geographical distances, hence some disparity. The groups were as follows:

The Western Group—Comprising the states of South Dakota, Iowa, Nebraska, Missouri, Illinois and Texas. This group held its contest in St. Louis, May 1st, as part of the program of the Fourth American Peace Congress.

The Central Group—Comprised the states of Ohio, Indiana, Michigan and Wisconsin, the contest being held at Goshen College, Goshen, Ind., April 25th.

The Eastern Group—Comprised the states of Maine, Massachusetts, New York, Pennsylvania, Maryland and North

Carolina. The contest of this group was held at Lafayette College, Easton, Pa., May 13th.

Ninety-eight colleges and universities in the sixteen states have participated in these contests and about 325 orations were written.

The final contest was held at Mohonk Lake, May 15th, in connection with the Lake Mohonk Conference. The Eastern Group was represented by Calvert Magruder, St. John's College, Annapolis, his subject being "Some Phases of the Peace Movement." The Central Group was represented by Paul B. Blanshard, of the University of Michigan, with the subject, "The Evolution of Patriotism." Vernon M. Welsh, of Knox College, Galesburg, Ill., represented the Western Group and had for his subject, "The Assurance of Peace."

Mr. Blanshard was awarded the first prize, Mr. Magruder the second prize and Mr. Welsh the third prize.

PRELIMINARY

MISSOURI ORATORICAL CONTEST

THE INTER-COLLEGIATE PEACE ASSOCIATION

Tuesday Evening, April 29, at 8 o'clock

SHELDON MEMORIAL AUDITORIUM

HON. SELDEN P. SPENCER, Presiding; MR. ASHLEY CABELL, MR. E. M. GROSSMAN, MR. EDWARD HIDDEN, Judges.

JUDGE SPENCER:

I will ask the two men at the door to see that after an oration has begun no one is admitted until the orator has finished, in order that he may not be disturbed. Probably the necessity for this precaution may not arise after the first speaker has finished. The speakers will follow each other in rapid succession, and the average time for each oration will be approximately from fifteen to twenty minutes. The first oration will be by Mr. George C. Willson, of the University of Missouri. His subject is "They, too, are Brothers." You see I not only announce the animals, but open the cage at the same time. (Laughter.)

They, Too, Are Brothers

G. C. WILLSON.

Twenty centuries ago, under Nero, lived a Roman slave; at the dawn of the Christian era he enunciated a prophecy which men have been slow to justify. That slave was Epictetus; that prophecy was of the universal recognition of the brotherhood of man.

The masters of that slave were the Romans; their ruling passion was war. Highest of the seven of Rome was the hill on which stood the temple of Mars; highest in the hearts of

these people was the throne of that god of battle; to him their young men were dedicated. They were seized with a lust for blood—these people—not the soldiers alone; it was a national characteristic. Even the rabble about the city demanded of Cæsar that he furnish them with combats, and in the afternoon they flocked to the circus where, for their amusement, man was pitted against his fellow, or thrown to the beasts. And to set the stamp of feminine approval on scenes like these, the Vestal Virgins came to grace the royal box, and when a gladiator fell, and the victor with sword upraised turned to hear the verdict of the people, he saw those dainty thumbs turned down—heard the flower of Roman womanhood say, "Let him die."

These were the times, the people of Epictetus. He was a slave—but within him stirred the soul of a man; he was a pagan—but his was a faith of brotherhood; he lived in an age of conquest—but he dreamed of a world at peace. He saw about him only strife among friends, only bloodshed among brothers. To him all men were brothers, for all were men, and he prayed to the Romans, "Will you not remember who you are and whom you rule? For they, too, are brothers; they are children of Zeus."

That lesson Epictetus as a Stoic teacher gave his followers. That lesson came from a Pagan slave, but since his death twenty centuries have gone and that lesson is still for man to learn.

For a time and in a selfish, restricted way men learned it readily enough. They saw that the Ishmael among men could not survive. The necessities of their unequal struggle for existence drove them to association into tribes or nations. Bound together, by community of race, of speech, they merged their individual identities into the national being of their people, acknowledged the validity of law, the dignity of government, the necessity of internal unity. They developed thus a consciousness greater than that of the individual and primitive man—but they only half learned their lesson. Beyond the confines of their own tribe or nation their narrow vision could not go. National pride and ambitions, racial antagonisms born

of centuries of strife and estrangement, continued to sway their judgment and to deceive their hearts.

They blinded themselves with the false magic of a name. What was "murder" among men was only "war" between nations. The private killer was an "assassin," the soldier was still a "hero." They set up a temple to a new god, scrawled over the threshold of that shrine an inscription to "the national honor," and on this new altar continued their human sacrifice. They had not yet learned that the curse of Cain may stamp its burning letters upon the forehead of a nation as readily as upon the guilty brow of a single slayer. The vision of the people was clouded, their hopes were centered upon ambitions inconsistent with thoughts of brotherhood.

England strove to be Mistress of the Seas; France was busy in the bitter discovery that the victories of war are vain and the cost too great to pay. Spain clung desperately to her hopes of primacy within the church and her dream of an empire beyond the western seas. China slumbered among the poppy fields of the East while India forgot all but the promised Nirvana that lay at the end of life. Russia quivered under the knout of the Romanoffs. America had become one great battlefield where the white man exterminated the Indian, then drove from his shores his English brothers, later pursued his scheme of conquest into Mexico, and finally, hardened to sights of struggle and accustomed to contention, he crossed swords with those to whom he was united by every bond of blood and kinship. The bitter memories of that struggle still live to belie our faith in our fellows, while from the sod that covers every Southern battlefield, that mercifully hides every Southern grave, the blood of our dead cries out, "There is no North, no South! My kindred slew me!"

Well might a Heaven-sent messenger, dispatched by the Creator to view his children and return with tidings, have paused when he neared the earth, hearing on every hand the clang of weapons, the cry of battle, the lament of the oppressed, and return to bear the message that some strange madness had blinded men, that they no longer knew their brothers.

But within these nations so inclined to battle, these peoples so willing to pay tribute to Mars, dwelt souls too great for struggle, too clear of vision to stop at boundaries of race or nation. The slave, courageous enough to prophesy of peace amid Roman conquests, was reproduced in every century after his voice was stilled. Few and scattered at first, they were derided as dreamers. Increasing in numbers their voices were too clear, the truths they proclaimed too obvious, to be disregarded. In Germany the great Kant told his dream of a universal state; in France Victor Hugo prophesied that soon we should come to look upon a cannon with amazement; in England Tennyson sang of the brotherhood of man, while from Russia Tolstoi heralded the end of the reign of Mars. Small wonder that the people listened to prophets like these.

Men began to reckon up the long unbalanced account of the God of War—they found him heavily in arrears. France reflected, "We have waved the fleur de lis in every capital in Europe; we have produced Napoleon, but he has exhausted us; we have bought the memory of the Old Guard with the blood of our young men." Frederick the Great accomplished the theft of Silesia, but he sapped the substance of his people; left his country a century behind in economic achievement. Germany accomplished unity, became a nation, but her birth-right was a heritage of enemies, encamped upon her every frontier. England was glorified in Nelson, but who knows whether the waters of Trafalgar bay closed over one worthy to rule with Gladstone? In Russia the mines awaited him who gave rein to his intellect or expression to his thought. In America we preserved the Union, but we laid waste the South, and when we would speak of peace to other warring nations, our hands, lately red with Spanish blood, must be hidden behind our backs.

Brought to their senses by considerations like these, men arraign Mars before the tribunal of reason, read the damning indictment written on every page of history, and find him guilty—realize that it is peace, not war, they want—harmony, not contention.

It is the process of a race becoming conscious of its own inherent oneness. The Gentile learns that while his fathers roamed in savage hordes thru the forest of Northern Europe, the ancestors of the Jew were the enlightened priests and keepers of the temple; before the new visions of the Occidental vanish the mists that lay over the East, and the West finds there a world done in its own image; in the crucible of the new world the races of all the earth fuse easily into one people, one nation, and men see that the antagonisms between those peoples existed only in their own imaginations.

The word "brotherhood" takes on a new and wider meaning and the question is no longer "Can we live at peace?" but "how soon?" Men are learning that what they disregarded as the fancy of a dreamer was in fact the faintly uttered hope of the whole heart of mankind; that the creed of the advocates of peace is a creed of faith and optimism, that their pleadings appeal to every impulse of love and friendship in the heart of man.

When man's vision finally is clear, when he realizes that he is a citizen not of a town or nation, but of a world, strife will cease for there will be none to contend; war will be forgotten, for there will be none to do battle—silent along the pathway of man will stand those ruined temples of Mars, abandoned to the past, mute witnesses of the madness from which we have recovered.

When men look back over the bloody path they have come, see that every heart laid bare in battle is a human heart, that every spirit breathed out to a martial air is the spirit of a man, that the soul offered up to Mars in any land, on any altar, is the soul of a brother, then will that prophecy of peace be fulfilled, that age-old hope be realized, and mankind as one voice say with that long-dead Roman slave, "We must remember, they, too, are brothers, they are the children of God."

JUDGE SPENCER:

Before I announce the next speaker it might be interesting to know that each one of these men represents his college, only after a contest in which he won. In other words, he has been

selected as the representative of the institution from which he comes; and the winner of tonight's contest, together with the winners of similar state contests in other parts of the country, will compete on Thursday afternoon at four o'clock in the Third Baptist Church auditorium; and Professor Hudson, who sits on the platform with me, has requested me to say that at that meeting, as well as at all meetings of the Peace Congress, a program of which each of you received tonight, you will be welcome.

The second speaker tonight is Mr. Sidna Poage Dalton, of Westminster College, and his subject is "The Demand for International Peace."

The Demand for International Peace

SIDNA POAGE DALTON.

The progress of the human race from savagery to civilization has been slow. Through all of the external changes man is yet the same creature—human nature is unchanged. We still possess the same instincts, appetites, and passions that our fathers possessed, though some have been redirected and controlled. It has been said that man is a fighting animal, and that born in every human breast is a love for battle that can not be destroyed. We do not wish to destroy this God-given instinct; we must direct it into legitimate fields, where it may develop and serve, not hinder, man's progress. In this, the most competitive of all ages, we must fight. Let us fight for progress and advancement—fight to live, rather than to kill and to destroy.

It is easy for one to notice a double standard in regard to the conduct of individuals and nations. The individual who wishes to secure peace and harmony shows himself friendly. He expresses trust and confidence in his fellows, and they in turn trust him. If every individual carried a loaded revolver and paraded about among his fellows, eyeing everyone with suspicion and displaying his arms in a threatening manner, would peace and harmony ever be possible? According to our present attitude, this is our ideal for securing peace among nations. Every nation must possess the largest army and

navy possible, so that an armed peace may be maintained. Is such a thing possible? Can peace by intimidation ever be lasting? There was a time, even in civilized countries, when individuals settled their most trivial disputes by duel. Today the standards have changed. Men now settle their difficulties by peaceable means. Since nations are aggregates of individuals, we have reason to believe that the time will soon come when nations shall settle their difficulties by arbitration, and not by war.

The part that war has played in the unification of the world has been small. The attempts to secure unity through force have proven costly and unsuccessful. Alexander conquered the known world, but when death released his hold, his kingdom crumbled. Rome with the sword built up a mighty empire, but the amassing of wealth, the desire for pleasure, and the immorality of her people proved ruinous, and Rome fell. Napoleon, by his conquests, built up an empire, but it was shattered under his hands. Even this warlike prodigy, when a prisoner on the island of St. Helena, wrote: "Alexander, Cæsar, Charlemagne, and myself have founded empires. We rested the creation of our genius upon force. Christ alone founded his empire upon love, and this moment millions of men would die for Him." The hatred, envy, and prejudice caused by war far exceeds its unifying tendencies. The question now comes—Do the accomplishments of war justify its costs? Did the results of the Civil War justify the price paid? Did it accomplish its purpose? I dare say, no! The cost of the war far exceeded the cash value of the slaves, to say nothing of the bloodshed and suffering, the destruction of wealth, the shock to business, and the increased immorality. Above all, the negro is a greater problem today than ever before, and the question of State's rights is yet an issue. Since war seldom fully accomplishes its purpose, even at so great a cost, why should the nations drain their resources, incur enormous debts, and destroy the products of civilization in the preparation for useless strife? If the millions of dollars which the leading nations of the world spend annually in the maintenance of large armies and navies were spent in building churches, schools, and hospitals, in relieving suffering and

disease, or in spreading the gospel of peace, the benefit to mankind would be unending. There would be no need for the great standing armies which today menace the peace and prosperity of the nations.

War is the result of passion. Small, fanatical, selfish minorities often sweep whole nations into its clutches. The ethics of war is that might makes right. It is not the decision of reason and justice, but the triumph of brute force and natural resources. The causes of war are ignorance, idleness, dissatisfaction, greed, and the unequal distribution of wealth. Men seek the excitement of conflict to escape the monotony of ordinary life. It is easy to get into trouble; hard to get out. War is easily started, hard to stop. It always means disaster to business; factories close, mines cease operation, the production of raw material stops, and thousands of men are thrown out of employment. If one nation prospers by war, it is at the expense of another. Arts, science, and literature are developed by peace. War hinders their progress. If civilization is to advance, we must have peace.

The world is fast becoming one great unit. The railroads, steamship lines, cables, telegraphs, and telephones are eliminating time and space and bringing into close relationship the remotest parts of the known world. The division of labor, begun among individuals, has been extended among nations. No nation is any longer entirely self-sufficient—all are interdependent. England produces less than one-third of her food supply, and only a small part of her raw material. In the United States, production far exceeds consumption. Each nation is in a measure dependent upon the others, and international trade is necessary. This interdependence and industrial unity of nations demands peace.

As international commerce has progressed, men have been drawn closer together. They have begun to realize that all men are brothers, and that co-operation is better than strife. The differences in race, customs, manners, language, and distance—once such effectual barrier to international affairs—are fast being swept aside. Men are now able to sympathize with, understand, respect, and admire each other. They find that they have much in common. Not only is the unity of the world

shown in this respect, and in the international trade, but also by the international investment of capital. The older and richer nations have long been investing their savings in the development of the natural resources in the New World. Thus their interests have been strongly unified. The safety of these investments is largely dependent upon the maintenance of peace. Since these conditions exist, war becomes more dangerous and destructive. A few days of war at present is more costly and destructive of life and property than years of war perhaps a century ago. Today the fearful cost of modern warfare is fast making it prohibitive. Now that all nations are closely related and interdependent, all are affected by any disturbance. To protect themselves, they must have peace. Trade and commerce are dependent upon peace. Self-protection demands peace.

The United States is the one great cosmopolitan nation. All races and peoples have mingled their blood in its formation. Today America stands alone untrammelled by the many alliances which bind the powers of Europe. We should lead in this great movement for international peace. Instead, it seems that we are trying to outstrip all nations in building battleships and preparing for war. Can we, who need no artificial protection, being separated from Europe and Asia by great oceans and with no formidable enemy near, expect to surpass those nations that do not possess these natural defenses? No! certainly not. We, by our activity, are only forcing them to greater efforts. By our greater armament we are bringing debt and danger, not only upon ourselves and posterity, but upon the whole world. Shall we continue to build battleships, costing millions of dollars, which in a few years will be out of date—fit only for rubbish and targets? Shall our national debt continue to increase with the years? Can we not see the folly of such conduct? Instead, let us promote friendship and confidence among nations and advance the cause of peace. We should not seek the protection of force—armies and battleships—rather the more secure protection of trust and confidence. Let us destroy provincialism, increase world unity, and demand international peace.

There is yet one demand for peace which far surpasses all others. It is more powerful than the demand of civilization for progress and advancement, more far-reaching than the demand of industrial unity for self-protection, more important than the conservation of resources, and more valuable than America's mission and influence. It is the demand of world-wide Christianity for universal peace. Why all this strife and contention? Why this sacrifice of human life? Why all this waste and destruction? Why these horrors and sufferings of battle? All because men have refused to accept the message of Jesus; they have failed to realize the gospel of love. Picture to yourself, if you can, the Christ as he beholds a modern battlefield, red with human blood. Imagine his grief, that after nineteen centuries of his teachings men have not yet learned the lesson of peace.

Awake! all ye nations! Rise up! all ye followers of Christ! Stand forth! as one man, an army for peace. Demand that war be forever abandoned and that peace reign supreme in its stead! Oh! that the "Prince of Peace" should hasten the day when war should no longer be possible, when brother should not take up arms against brother, nor should blood be spilled by man's hand. Then "they shall beat their swords into plowshares, and their spears into pruning hooks; nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more."

JUDGE SPENCER:

The third oration of tonight will be delivered by Mr. John Leo Tierney, of St. Louis University, whose subject is "International Peace."

International Peace

JOHN LEO TIERNEY.

War as an institution is world-old. Every bard, chronicler and historian exalts it. Not a bit of script, from the fragmentary evidence of early Egypt to the voluminous works of the past century, fail to speak of it. Sounding and stately hexametres chant of the heroes of Troy; brilliant, existing lines tell of modern strife. There is no doubt an irresistible

thrill in the call to arms, the clarion bugle, the clash of steel on steel, the roar of artillery, the sharp command, the concerted charge of a legion of men, the majestic, all sweeping, terrible shock of opposing lines of human flesh. It is sublime in its immensity as a death-dealing bolt from a blackened sky is sublime; it is terrible in its grandeur as a storm at sea is terrible; and we, psychologically susceptible as we are in our entrancement, fail to appreciate the underlying facts. The modern mind is so constituted that it must have rapid action. It likes the moving picture, rapid transportation, the swiftly-moving plot in story, and consequently, it likes the hurrying narratives of strife.

We admire the heroes who fought and died for a cause, and our very souls are filled with a curiosity—morbid, pleasurable awe—when we contemplate those terrific struggles of the past. But let us divorce ourselves from impressions; let us shear war of its halo of patriotism, its garb of righteousness, and fair-mindedly consider it in its plain, disgusting nudity.

What is war? Lord Bacon defines it: "One of the highest trials of right; when powers and states that acknowledge no superior on earth, shall put themselves upon the justice of God for the deciding of their controversies by such successes as it shall please Him to give to either side." To God, the Divine Exemplar, the Prince of Peace, to decide a struggle in which He, Himself, is the last consideration, is to mock God. Picture a battle. Two half-savage hordes in a state of hypnotic patriotism with every elemental passion unleashed, rushing on each other to kill, the blood-lust surging in their red hearts, the fires of hate leaping from their blood-shot eyes. Picture all the lurid glare and abysmal gloom of battle, hear the crunch of human flesh upon flesh, the tearing of sinews and the snap of bones, hear the curses, blasphemies, prayers, shrieks and moans of the dying—dying perhaps for an emperor's whim—see the gaping wounds, the shattered limbs, the headless corpses; revel in that cataclysmic medley of sights and sounds and call God to witness the justice! Go at night when the strife is over and kneel there among the "still forms that lie with faces clotted to the ground or upturned under the silent stars!" Kneel and

breathe a prayer of thankfulness for victory, victory at that price, to God if you dare! Follow an invading army into the conquered city, watch their orgy, drunk with victory, with wanton will they careen through the streets with conscience wide as hell, Mammon their God, lust their King. See the plunder—see sweet virginity sacrificed on the altar of a brutish lust. See the broken heart of a mother as she sobs over her fallen boy; see the pathetic eyes of a wife for a husband that will never return; see homeless children; see all the sorrow and pain, and then, with perverted piety, call the Prince of Peace to witness the justice of it all!

War as a determination of justice is a farce. Two wrongs never make a right. Considered from an economic aspect—I accentuate the word economic—both in the matter of money and men, war is not justifiable. The United States is expending over seventy per cent on past and future wars, and every year expends three hundred million dollars on its army and navy. Lloyd George in a recent speech says that two billion two hundred and fifty million dollars raised by taxation is spent for armament with a yearly increase of one billion dollars. The war debt of France is six billion dollars with an annual interest of two hundred and forty-six million dollars. The war debt of Europe is twenty-six billion dollars, a debt that, with its enormous interest, never can be paid. If unchecked it means the collapse of industry and the pauperization of the masses. The world's entire stock of gold is not equal to one-fourth of the war debt. But this never stops; the rapacious monster war, whether active or passive, gulps the world's wealth. Nations, urged on by the wild promptings of militarism, vie with nations in increasing their armament. If Japan has two dreadnaughts we must have four. The old frigate has given place to the modern battleship; the muzzleloaders to the breech-loading, rapid-fire artillery. The aeroplane has made its advent with its terrible possibilities for destruction. We go on and on, striving not to be outdone in the wild frenzy, applying all our ingenuity and skill to the scientific dealing of death. Meanwhile that debt grows larger, to crush the masses

a little closer to the earth. We draw nearer to bankruptcy, armed to the teeth. Where will it all stop? Cochran says a parallel of this lunacy can not be found in all history.

Again war in the economy of the world's manhood is unjustifiable. Napoleon transformed the fair sunlit fields of Europe into reeking, bloody wastes, dotted with skulls of three millions of the world's best men. If the skulls of those who fell before the military genius of the little Corporal were stacked together they would form a pile fifty times as high as the Washington monument—a gruesome monument to the damnable ambition of one man. Of the six hundred thousand who proudly crossed the Nieman for the conquest of Russia only twenty thousand half-naked, famished, frost-bitten, unarmed spectres staggered across the bridge of Corno in the middle of December.

In our own great Civil War we strewed the land with six hundred and fifty thousand of the South's chivalry and the North's sturdy manhood. Every nation has the same tale of woe, every land has its monuments and its heroes, every nation has fed its fair youth into the capacious maw of the grim war god. Every land has its attendant train of broken spirits and blackened hearts, every land has its host of broken heart-strings, torn by the mailed hand of war. And of what avail? Of what avail, I ask, has been this gigantic waste of men and money? What have the three hundred European wars within the past four centuries accomplished? Naught but the satisfaction of a natural ambition or the transient acquisition of a paltry piece of land.

Where is warlike Greece? Alexander conquered the world, but where is the empire of Alexander? Where is Spain, that made men to waste them? Where are all the great nations of antiquity? Militarists say we need great wars to purge our nations of the unfit. Rome sat in her glory on the seven hills and sent her men forth to win new glory and to die. They did die and a progeny of slaves, camp followers and peddlers filled the streets of Rome, a brood little capable of handling affairs of state or of maintaining an acquired glory. War does not purge of the unfit. In the last call it takes the

best and bravest and leaves a coward brood to breed our coming manhood. What did Napoleon gain for France in return for her brave souls? Nothing, and even the impressionable French realize it. A few years ago a brief item went the rounds of the world's press. One of the enterprising journals of Paris conducted a ballot of the whole nation to decide who was the greatest hero of France. The votes came in by the thousands and passed into millions and that vote of an entire people repudiated Napoleon and named as their pre-eminent national hero a man of peace—Pasteur, whose victories were not on the battlefield, but at the bedside of the sick and in the recesses of the laboratory. Truly the glory of war and the fame of its heroes are transient.

War is a travesty on justice; a waste of money and a waste of men—a waste with no adequate return. War is the great illusion, for whether there be victory or defeat it brings naught but pain, sorrow and bankruptcy. What then is the remedy?

Knowing human nature, whether in the individual or in the aggregate, we know that there will always be disputes, but we maintain that they should not be settled by violence, because settlement by violence is a failure. The time for war has passed. The day has come when the disputes of the nations should be settled by a court arbitration. International arbitration makes for a golden age universal peace.

This idea of international arbitration is not a new one. It has been given to great minds in all ages to see the fallacy of "the great illusion," and to advocate peaceful settlement. Look at the work already accomplished at The Hague. The Dogger case, the Muscat case, the Venezuela Preferential; the Fisheries case; the Casa Blanca which united Germany and France after they stood apart for forty years in irreconcilable antagonism. Some of these results it is true have not met with popular favor because the thoughtless mind is too ready for violent sentiment in preference to solid logic. However, this hesitancy on the part of the general public and on the part of the nations to give our proposal their whole-hearted confidence and support, is no argument against its practicability. Neither is it an argument against its ultimate triumph.

There is no enlightened citizen of our land today who does not approve of the United States Supreme Court; or who does not look to it with the utmost confidence to settle the great questions of national and interstate dispute. And yet, what is the early history of that great tribunal? For five years not a single case was referred to it for adjustment, simply because there existed a popular prejudice against the idea of such a court. Once that prejudice was removed and the institution given a chance to show its efficiency, every specious argument against the plan was speedily swept aside by the hard logic of accomplished facts.

In a like way, my friends, will an enlightened public opinion, which it is your work and mine to create and nourish, change what the unthoughtful hold to be a dream of fools into a blessed reality for all mankind. Modern conditions of life which bind men of all lands close together by bonds of religion, commerce, science and social friendship, make bloody war particularly monstrous and unnatural, and raise a clamorous demand for some way of settling inevitable differences without a call to arms. To meet just this righteous demand has The Hague Conference been established; and despite initial disappointments, there is a reasonable hope that its certain triumph will not be long delayed.

Think of the happiness and blessings that will come to an entire world recognizing the brotherhood of man and obedient to the gospel of peace. Try to comprehend the tremendous benefits to humanity, with the millions now spent in war and preparations for war turned into channels of educational improvement and social uplift. A well-known writer has said: "Give me the money that has been spent in war and I will purchase every foot of land upon the globe. I will clothe every man, woman and child in an attire of which kings and queens would be proud. I will build a school house on every hillside and in every valley over the whole earth. I will build an academy in every town and endow it, a college in every State and fill it with able professors. I will crown every hill with a place of worship consecrated to a gospel of peace. I will support in every pulpit an able teacher of righteousness, so that

on every Sabbath the chimes on every hill will answer to the chimes on another around the world."

Let us turn then from war, that with bloody heel crushes all beneficence. Let us turn from that destroyer of law, morals, arts and progress. Let us turn from that medley of horrors, the dead and the dying, the rapine and the pestilence, famine, broken hearts, blackened homes. Let us turn from all that terrible drama of blood and sorrow, and with open hearts receive the great gospel of peace. As Sumner says: "Let the enormous means thus released from iron hands be devoted to labors and beneficence. Our battlements shall be schools, hospitals, colleges and churches; our arsenals shall be libraries; our navies shall be peaceful ships on errands of perpetual commerce; our armies shall be teachers of youth and ministers of religion.

This happy consummation can not be realized unless we each and every one take an active part. Let every man and woman recognize and teach their children to recognize the force of public opinion, the potency of public sentiment. We know that the cry, "Remember the Maine," in the throats of a mawkish rabble forced the war with Spain. But reason, not sentiment, must be our guide. Give yourselves whole-heartedly to the work of forming a public opinion that will place justice above false ideals of national honor. Use all the means in your power—the Church, the School, the Public Press—to inculcate the sacred doctrines of peace. Join to natural means and motives, means and motives that are from above. Re-establish the world's moral and intellectual activities on the principle of Christian ethics. Turn men back to the teachings of Christ, the great Master of Israel, back to the observance of the Ten Commandments, the revealed expression of the law of God written in the hearts of men, given in the thunder and lightning of Sinai. Lift high the standard of the Christian—Universal Peace.

Let your voices, the voices of peace-loving people, sound in the councils of states and kings. Controversies will arise, but when they do, let the cry of the great vox populi be, on to The Hague and not to the fields of bloody strife for justice.

May our beloved America become and do your part, every one, to make it a second isle of Delos, sacred to peace for the world's example—a world where sweet Christian charity is queen, and justice king to reign forever over a world of universal peace.

JUDGE SPENCER:

The fourth oration will be by Mr. Arnold J. Tuschschmidt, of Washington University, the subject being "The Justice and Honor of Nations."

Justice and Honor of Nations

ARNOLD J. TUSCHSCHMIDT.

The whole world in general—this representative congress in particular—has before it one of the greatest questions, not alone of the present day and of all time past, but truly can it be predicted one of the greatest that can arise for all time to come. Hallowed by the noblest motives that ever stirred within the human breast—standing alone as it does in the immensity of its application of the fundamental principle of all progress, it can only be viewed as the conception of a God and as such be hoped to be worthily venerated. Peace—International Peace—Peace to the world is that conception.

This twentieth century by no means looks lightly upon the international conflicts of the past almost six thousand years. But we should view the errors of the Pharaohs more tolerantly than we should those of the Roman Emperors—and again, at the present day in which an advancing civilization is calling, not alone man to man, but nation to nation, to a more strict account of its every action than ever before, we feel obliged to look the deeper for the motive for the abandonment by a nation of one of the greatest blessings it is in the power of the Might-on-high to bestow—Peace to its People.

What more worthy cry than that for peace! With the cry for peace has been ushered in two thousand years ago the grandest era the world bids ever to know. With a prayer for peace we open the day and with a thanksgiving for it, is the

day brought to a close. Peace in the home bringing peace to the town, from peace to the town to that to the state, from the state to the nation and from the nation to the world is our present interest. It is only while at peace that the individual is in full possession of his faculties, and similarly the proper development and the most efficient employment of the tremendous resources of every nation is a problem for the day upon which there will have been introduced a spirit of universal fraternity, which in turn will not be accomplished until the only relic of barbarism that has survived to our time will have been banished.

It is right that we view the advent of the peace of the world as a day for the greater security of the homes in all lands—as a day for the encouragement as never before of international commerce—a day for the introduction of initiative, faith, and co-operation, supplanting fear, distrust and opposition. But of even greater importance will be our good fortune in partly satisfying needs that have appealed for centuries past to providence itself—the need for justice—and the need for humanity.

Justice in international affairs—the impartial judgment of both sides of a controversy—finds no expression whatever in an issue upon which there has been brought to bear the influence of power. From the moment the consideration of the physical inequality between nations from the point of view of their acceptance or rejection of a verdict enters, justice ceases to exist. And just so long as the nations of the world recognize no common bond of friendship—just so long as they view themselves as isolated units in themselves, with antagonistic interests, instead of given sections of a unit, the earth—just so long must we expect a double interpretation of what constitutes equity upon every international difference that arises. And when, as has often hitherto occurred, the two verdicts disagree to such an extent that a compromise is impossible, comes the appeal to arms—War—not because either nation would cease to exist if a slightly greater concession on one side than on the other would be made—or because as war is thought more economical than such an

additional concession—for history most emphatically proves the contrary—but because of the need for the preservation of the national honor.

It is to the national honor—to the maintenance of the dignity of the position of a nation among nations—which in turn finds its highest expression in the support, and if need be, the enforcement of justice—that all other considerations must bow. War, that greatest of calamities, that crime against conscience and humanity, becomes but secondary importance when this most sacred of principles has been invoked.

War, the very thought of which is horrible—a fearful penalty (for penalty it is)—a terrible affliction to visit upon the heads of an innocent mass, to whom the cares of mere existence alone and in normal times is a burden sufficiently heavy. What suffering—what misery among the poorer classes, the huge majority, and how it must cry for relief—cry aloud and cry to the only power to which it is allowed to address itself—the power infinite—God.

A national debt piled high; a cessation of enterprise and expansion; a demoralization of the industries hurling unemployed upon the streets to find their bread—and eventually more or less of a financial depression. Desolation and ruin in the paths of the movement itself; the field of battle—the wounded, the dying and the dead; agony, torture, death; a field of fathers, husbands, sons and brothers—grief to insanity for mothers, wives and sisters and an orphanage for the little ones that can only cry.

Has anything whatever been accomplished? No! Has the death of thousands of men and has the greater oppression of the poor changed the situation in the very least? No! Is the justice of the victor and the error of the vanquished now a proved fact in the eyes of the world? No—and most decidedly not.

The point of view from which the war was thought necessary, is that of national honor. Both sides had felt themselves called upon in defense of righteousness and would have scorned to recede an inch if the whole world would have come

against them. Standing alone and each representing in itself the highest authority on earth, left them no alternative.

The very possibility of such a development—the possibility of nations being put to the need of upholding the national honor through the at times unavoidable complications that our advancing civilization is making the more and more intricate—voices the crying need of the present day.

That need is an international court of arbitration. A court, representative of every nation of the world—for the adjustment of controversies upon which no agreement could be reached by the individual governments. A court occupying the position as the highest authority on earth, the acceptance of whose decisions would then constitute the supreme test of national honor—and yet a court that would place absolutely no restriction upon royal or presidential prerogative, and whose sphere of action would be limited.

This is a grand conception indeed—and the establishment of such a tribunal a task that will require and will tax to the extreme, the most profound legal and diplomatic acumen. But before a definite step in that direction can be made, there will be required such a development of public opinion as will assure the co-operation of both people and governments.

The past twenty-five years has seen a great impetus given the movement for international arbitration. The Hague tribunal stands a monument to the dispositions of both nations and individuals that have been instrumental in its establishment. Of great importance and encouragement are the examples given to the world by the arbitration treaties between England and France and the United States, as well as the present attitude of other European countries and of nations of the Orient and of Central and South America. Already great wars have been avoided and conflicts begun have been brought to a close through arbitration. Witness the effect of arbitration between England and France in 1843—between England and the United States at Geneva in 1872—and recently the fact that arbitration brought to a close the Russo-Japanese war and prevented possible hostilities between Russia and England at that time.

There is no hesitation in acknowledging the immense difficulties that stand in the way of the institution of an international court. It is only right that they exist, and they are welcomed. The innovation is a tremendous one and requires all the delicacy of treatment that can be brought to bear. The basis of representation—the relation of this court or congress to the national legislatures—the formation of a code of international law—and the usual number of minor problems will present themselves. The fact that a unanimous shout for international arbitration from every recognized power on earth would be expecting too much for the near future, may suggest the necessity of a group of the larger nations taking the initiative and establishing a court in which it shall be to the highest interest of every country to be represented.

It is not until this point has been reached that disarmament can be discussed—or better still, after the inauguration of the court—be left to take care of itself. The cry for greater armies and navies will then become more and more ridiculous, and it may not be going a step too far to predict, with one of the greatest men of the eighteenth century, such a prosperity and enlightenment as to accomplish the realization of the time in which “cannon will be exhibited as a symbol of barbarism.”

International peace has for its keynote arbitration—logical, correct, civilized and just. To the rescue must come the home, the school, the church, social and business organizations. The newspapers and public speakers have here a most noble field—and the men present today—in addition to enjoying the honor of being the representatives from the most civilized nations of the world in the most civilized movement that has yet been undertaken—in addition to having their man himself—deserve to the fullest, if ever human being has presence here pay the highest tribute to the character of the deserved, the benediction,

“Blessed are the Peacemakers, for they
shall be called the children of God.”

JUDGE SPENCER:

You will notice on the program the first prize is \$75.00, given by the Intercollegiate Peace Association.

The second prize of \$50.00 is given by the Peace Congress, largely through the generosity of The Business Men's League, who have also provided a prize for Thursday afternoon. The winner on Thursday afternoon will be the district winner who, with the winners from three other districts in the United States, will meet at Lake Mohonk next month for the final contest in this series, where a prize will be given for the winner of the whole. I am sure Mr. Smith and Mr. Stevens, who are sitting back there, would be very glad if they could have heard what one of the contestants said to me, after I had said, "That \$75.00 is not so bad." He said, "You bet it isn't, but even that second prize looks like a mountain to me." (Laughter.)

The next speaker will be Mr. Edward Vernon Nash, of Central College. His subject is "Our Relation to Peace."

Our Relation to Peace

EDWARD VERNON NASH.

When the grand old prophet Nathan, standing with flashing eye before King David, said, "Thou art the man!" he was but putting into practice the universal principle of direct appeal. The real problem of any reform is to arouse the individual to a sense of the need for a change. Generalization has ever been the soothing potion with which mankind has lulled into sleep the insistent demands of an urgent conscience. The triteness of the statement, "Everybody's business is nobody's business," does not in any way vitiate it. When I say, "You should become thoroughly stirred by the need for international peace," do I not appeal to you much more than with the statement, "The people of the United States should be moved by this great need?"

But knowledge of the status of world peace must precede such an effect. Education has always been the advance agent of reform. Review with me, therefore, the evolution of peace

and let us consider together its situation at the present time. That, which we call peace, whether it was known as "pax," "paix," or "friede," meant, until the beginning of modern times, simply a short interval between wars. Fighting was the chief occupation of the ancient and mediaeval peoples, and peace was merely "time-out" in which the combatants might regain their wind. By the close of the thirteenth century, however, governments had become centralized, and personal jealousies had given way to patriotism. War was now waged to avenge a national injury or to acquire territory. Vendetta warfare grew gradually less frequent; pitched battles were fought; military tactics were studied and wars were known as hundred or thirty-year wars. Necessarily, therefore, the interim of peace grew longer, and was more truly peace. During this development, peace sentiment has more than kept the pace. The tables are now almost completely turned. War to us means peace broken by a short struggle. This view has gradually influenced the world until millions now believe that peace should be absolute universal peace. Others more optimistic believe that such a condition is now upon us. Yet great men, whose opinions are worthy of our consideration, express their disbelief in the possibility, and some even in the advisability of this condition. What are some of the arguments pro and con?

Someone has said that nations are simply individuals multiplied. They have their passions aroused; have tempers, brainstorms and all the attributes of a single person. Therefore, they say, peace is impossible. Perhaps harmony is not possible, but, as individuals settle their differences in the courts and the argument is that a nation is a large individual, therefore nations should do likewise.

The ambition and greed of nations is perhaps the greatest menace to international peace. The very heart of the world is chilled at times by the serpent's hiss of envy or is saddened as ambition's eagle soars out on a mission of rapine more befitting a vulture. Yes, we say, jealousy and distrust will be much harder to exterminate, because these characteristics are so deeply a part of every human being. But who is not

able to discern the growth of a universal democracy, that in the hearts and minds of world citizenship sectional boundary lines are being obliterated?

But many go even further and plead the inadvisability of discontinuing war. Manhood would suffer, they say. If the inherent combative qualities in man are stifled, effeminacy would follow. Here it seems, we fail to distinguish between war and the equivalent of war. Are there not other things which draw on man's courage and tax his powers of endurance? No one doubts the need of sturdy manhood, nor the need of fields where it may exercise its strength. But must we believe that crimson meadows must be strewn with the dead and dying; must homes be destroyed and lives blighted, in order to reach the highest type?

Ah! Come with me, some beautiful day in spring to the summit of a mountain, looking down upon as lovely a scene as could be conceived of by the mind of man. Directly below us winds a meandering stream. On either side herds of cattle are grazing, and here and there are fields of growing grain, in which happy and contented toilers can be seen. Like jeweled adornments in the gown of a queen, the whole scene is dotted with the homes of the happy workers. Ah, you say, this is a wonderful land and ours is a fortunate people. Yes; but come with me another day, and looking down, force yourself to listen to the shrieks and moans of the wounded and dying. Behold the beautiful meadows become scenes of carnage and slaughter, and see the streams run red with human blood. And as the roar of the cannon and the scream of the bursting shell salute your years, ask yourself if it is possible, twenty centuries after the birth of that princely man of peace, who said, "I came that they might have life, and that more abundantly," that thousands of human beings are seeking to slay their fellowmen upon a battlefield. Let us descend after the battle and, leaning low over some wounded soldier, hear him breathe a tender farewell to some loved one at home. And as we pillow his gory head and ease his pain as best we can, see the light of life slowly fade from his manly eyes. Then reverently, let us take up the body and go with

it to its last resting place. And as we approach a little cottage, nestled cosily among the hills, and hear the shriek of anguish of the mother or the moan of despair of a loving wife, let us vow before God to do all in our power to drive back into the pit, this "the foulest fiend ever vomited out of the mouth of hell."

But this is only one case, and as we stand in a lofty tower and watch a fleet of ships shelling a city; see the streets and lovely lawns covered with men, and (more awful thot) women and children; as we turn our eyes in horror from this, and peering out to sea, watch a huge leviathan careen and roll, and, suddenly, with one last tremor, seek the bottom with all its human cargo; then as floating bodies reach the shore, and you look back at the city covered with dead and dying, force yourself to realize that for every death there is a wife or mother waiting anxiously back at the old homestead. Again as we look forward to the long lonely years of the future, see the slow sure inroads of poverty, and witness the sight, sad beyond words, of women and children forced to toil in grinding sweatshops to sustain life; see squalor take the place of prosperity and contentment give way to despair, let us resolve to be forever opposed to that which robs a happy home of its defender and provider. Can we but vow to do all in our power to bring about the time when "nation shall not take up arms against nation, neither shall they learn war any more?"

Shall we say that the obstacles are too great? Do questions of national honor or of just and oppressive rulership constitute insuperable barriers to the consummation of world peace. God forbid! Let us dwell upon the superb achievements of the past; The Hague Peace Conferences, the International Court of Arbitration in the new Peace Palace, the International Prize Court, and while the horror of a war is yet upon us, let us gaze upon another scene. Come with me across the waters and let us stand before that resplendent beauty in marble, the new Peace Palace at The Hague.

Enter with me and see the plenipotentiaries of two great powers deciding, without hate or rancour, a question of dispute. Let us walk into a chamber where in a few years an

International Supreme Court will sit. Then as you think of the peaceful valleys left unpolluted, of prosperous cities enjoying greater prosperity, of homes left undestroyed, and of happy hearts growing ever happier, let the words "Peace on earth, good will to men," speak courage to your doubting heart.

A mighty horde of opposing forces looms out before us. But without a vision of victory, the people must perish. Courage must drive out hopelessness, as we seize the weapons at our disposal to be used in this war against war. In the first place, war is never really a settlement. Arbitration is ultimate; why not previous to such enormous losses of life and property. The uncertainty of war, the awfulness of modern chemical and mechanical inventions, which make Sherman's definition of war wholly inadequate, and especially the antagonistic attitude of both capital and labor to war, are very telling factors for peace. The capital of the world desires peace. The interbuying of securities is unifying the world and commercial relations have risen above national boundaries. A well-known peace advocate recently said that should a German army capture London, the first move of the German general would be to put a guard about the Bank of England, for should that institution fail, financial panic would result throughout the world. The laboring man has come to see that he has always been the chief sufferer in war, and he opposes it. As he sees that seventy per cent of our national taxes goes to make up the war budget, and that the money thus expended would, in a few years, dig a Panama canal or a deep waterway from the Lakes to the Gulf, he favors peace.

But preëminent in the realm of peace, stands The Hague Tribunal, or International Court of Arbitration, because it provides a concrete something around which the nations can gather. We are swiftly approaching the crucial point in the spread of world peace. All that is needed is international agreement to refer all disputes to an International Supreme Court, and with this agreement, a gradual decrease in the armament of nations, so that the foolish paradox of armed peace shall be no more. The peoples of the world are looking

expectantly toward the United States. Pioneers in all fields, related to the peoples' welfare, the United States must lead the nations in procuring peace. Will she fail to take advantage of her great opportunity? Not if you and I and millions of others become imbued with such a burning desire for peace, as to unite in one insistent, unequivocal demand for it. Public opinion, when fully aroused, is one of the few human agencies wholly irresistible. The scrap-pile of the centuries is heaped high with things cast there by the awakened conscience of the people.

Here then is our relation to peace. Can we shudder at the Hindu mother of the Ganges offering her babe as a burnt offering to her gods, and continue ourselves to sacrifice millions of men in the prime of life to the insatiable Moloch of war. Must we not bring every influence to bear to drive Mars forever from our land and in his stead to enthrone the goddess of peace? Ah, yes; a great, a princely privilege is ours. We can do all in our power now and purpose in our hearts for the future. From these halls have gone forth great men—statesmen, bishops, men famed in all callings—In a few years you will be filling similar places of influence and power. May we resolve to be ever animated with the spirit of the Quaker poet, as he exclaimed:

“Sing the bridal of nations; with chorals of love;
Sing out the war vulture, and sing in the dove.
Till the hearts of the peoples keep time in accord,
And the voice of the world is the voice of the Lord!
Clasp, hands of the nations,
In strong gratulations,
The dark night is ending; the dawn has begun!
Rise, hope of the ages, arise like the sun;
All speech flow to music, all hearts beat as one.”

JUDGE SPENCER:

The last speaker will be Mr. Frank R. Birkhead, of William Jewell College. His subject is "War, the Sum of Wretchedness."

War, the Sum of Wretchedness

FRANK R. BIRKHEAD.

The history of the world is a tragedy of blunders. Every age has foisted on the world a new deception. Kings and princes of many lands, for the extension of their sovereignty, have been deluded into bold and hazardous enterprises, that have been disastrous beyond description.

In a period of irrational religious fervor witchcraft descended as a blight on Europe and the American colonies. The people of the world will ever mourn for the innocent lives that were sacrificed in that sad blunder. Witchcraft was so futile, irreligious, and inhuman that modern men marvel at the benighted minds that nurtured such an institution.

Slavery thrived in its time; indeed, it became so fastened upon one nation that nothing less than a great civil strife could break the fetters that held millions in thralldom. Thanks to the hand of the Emancipator, the curse of bondage was put away, and the ship of state was guided out into the peaceful waters of national unity.

Dueling was once the common redress of wrong, and many a chevalier found solace to a wounded pride in the resort to arms. Later, and within the time of our fathers, that deception was banished and the arm of the law was raised against its return.

Though these superstitions and fallacies have passed away, never to be resurrected by a civilized people, and though the nations have seen and profited by their utter failure, there yet remains the darkest blot of all, the most calamitous illusion that ever blinded a nation. Witchcraft, even though its victims numbered the fairest of the world's virgins, was but a passing curse. Slavery, at its worst, did not thrust itself upon those states to whom it was repulsive. Dueling may be partially condoned, for its participants were invariably men whose

selfishness was exceeded only by their disregard for law. War remains the inexcusable tragedy of tragedies, the destructive monster of the ages.

Martin Luther said: "War is one of the greatest plagues that can afflict humanity; it destroys religion, it destroys state, it destroys family." Rousseau declared: "War is the foulest fiend ever vomited from the mouth of hell."

War is misery: See Napoleon and his six hundred thousand elite of France start on the conquest of Russia. Follow that magnificent pageant throughout its march, and finally, see the spectres of scarcely twenty thousand men return through the blasts of a Russian winter, leaving the blood of proud France on the snowy path between Moscow and the Bridge of Karno.

War is violence: It regards neither age nor sex. It is cankerous and eats with insatiable hunger into all that is pure. Four times the combined forces of Christendom hurled their knights against Saracen cohorts, and four times these mailed panoplies met utter destruction on the plains of Palestine, made holy by the feet of the Nazarene. The motive of the Crusaders was good, but their zeal took the path of violence and indescribable death.

War is theft: It robs the pauper and confiscates the wealth of aristocracy. From the state it demands the stoutest sinews and the keenest intellect. Those whom God has most richly endowed as the leaders of peaceful pursuits are the first to be sacrificed on the altar of war. Virginia, once a commonwealth great in achievements of peace, has lost a prestige, perhaps, never to be regained. Grim-visaged war, when it sounded the death-knell of the Confederacy, sealed the fate of her fairest state. Italy, sunny Italy, that once flourished amid a sea of roses and olive groves, has been robbed of her heritage. Italy is today a state of paupers living out a bare existence on the fields of a thousand battles.

War is the sum of all wretchedness. It is famine, pollution, and vile murder. It sets brother against brother; it tramples under mailed feet the decalogue. It transforms a land of tranquility into a furnace of shrapnel and canister and

fragments of bursting shell. Its stench is wafted to the remotest corners of the earth and into the very sanctums of humanity.

Modern governments are deceptive. They appear to solace themselves with the thought that charity covers a multitude of sins. In the role of the philanthropist they scatter here and there balms for the oppressed, while tax-gatherers loot the meager savings of toilers. They build hospitals and asylums, only to be filled with war's degenerates. While the bountiful hand of charity ministers to the bread line of the poverty-stricken city and the fiends of disease and vultures of iniquity hover over the places of squalor, the proud fleet of battle-craft rides majestically on the harbor's bosom, engaged in no mission and existing for no purpose, save the annihilation of men.

Statesmen and the press stand as a unit against the sacrifice of life in civil pursuits, yet as false patriots, they rise in senates and parliaments and plead for more deadly armaments. Governments are noble teachers, but the question which is rising to the ministers and potentates of the world powers is this, "thou who teachest others, teachest thou not thyself?"

No individual can see the absolute futility of excessive armaments unless he dismisses national prejudice. The eagle, from his craggy nest high above the haunts of man, sees the entire landscape without delusion. Every component part is revealed in a naturalness which is absent at the low level. The world-citizen looks beyond his own interests and the narrow confines of his own state. He sees the German in Hong Kong and Boston and Liverpool plying his commerce with dexterity. He sees England, the banker of the world, dealing out her tender to Russia and Egypt and Japan. He sees America, like a good sister of the poor, reaching out a sustaining arm to all peoples in distress. With this dependence and interdependence of nations, the honest patriot may well mark the folly of raising between peoples insurmountable walls of hostility.

Europe is one vast arsenal, the saddest of all the exhibitions of militarism. There governments are engaged in a mad competition that has no end and no reward. And why? For centuries the children of European peoples have been brought

up with the wild strains of battle songs ringing in their ears. Every boy, in his childish play, is a young soldier at Sebastopol or Austerlitz or Waterloo. There, the mothers sing their babes to sleep with the songs of warriors bold. Every meadow is a battlefield; every marble shaft, the monument of a fallen general, and each epitaph thereon the story of never-ending violence.

England has a navy, the strength of which is not equaled by the combined strength of her two nearest rivals. Germany has the finest and most perfectly equipped army in all the world. Military and naval splendor is grand to behold, but what of the afterglow, when all grandeur has passed away?

Europe's three hundred million souls are cringing beneath a burden of taxation which militarism has placed upon them. Their land is taxed, their incomes, their raiment, their salt—yes, even what savings they lay aside for life's shadows when they can no longer toil. And from the squalid hovels of London and Berlin and Rome, and from the barren steppes of Russia and the dark retreats of begging Spain come the curses of the rabble, the mutterings of dissatisfied and unnourished peoples.

For one hundred years the United States has enjoyed almost perfect peace with foreign nations, yet, we are paying a price for an armament which, if not reduced, will pauperize our government beyond recovery. Three-fourths of the revenue is expended for war and the results of war. It is wasteful; it is sinful; and by all that is just, the agitators of armies and navies, fashioned after the delirious policies of Europe, will soon answer for the grievous crime of misleading a peace-loving and peace-abiding people.

Patriotism is noble; but when it demands the starving of subjects to satisfy the vanity of their sovereigns; and when it demands the sweating of blood and the cudgeling of men, who hear no music save the rhythmic beat of machinery, and who see naught save the rough path of toil, 'twere better that it be suppressed. Away with such a deception, it was born of fear and nurtured by selfishness!

Shame! upon the political pirates who skulk behind the pretense of defending national honor. They have assassinated their governments and heaped calumny upon their peoples. How long will this gigantic preparation for war continue? How long will the sick, the lame, and the humble in spirit gather in the low places to curse their governments?

“Were half the power that fills the world with terror,
 Were half the wealth bestowed on camps and courts
 Given to redeem the human mind from error,
 There were no need for arsenals and forts.”

They say we are unreasonable in advocating peace. I ask—is it not unreasonable for governments to press down upon their peoples unjust burdens? Is it not unreasonable for statesmen to cry war! when there is no war, and confiscation! when there is no confiscation?

Gloating over the vanquished is vain; flaunting the insignia of victory is madness. Strength of nation does not consist in the number of battleships that rides the waves, or the armies that keep step to the martial music. Did not Prussia humble France and extort an indemnity? Yet it was not victory, nor was the indemnity a benefaction. Within the short space of ten years France was so prosperous and Germany so depressed that Bismarck, that old war dog, exclaimed, “Germany, yes, Germany is bleeding to death.”

Militarism is doomed! Alongside this mad race for armed supremacy has come the counter-movement of international disarmament and world-peace. Every legislator’s plea for an extension of the war policy has been admirably answered by a score of peacemakers, who in their dreams anticipate a Federation of the World.

The modern peace movement is purely an effort to induce nations to observe those moral laws which govern individuals. Law provides punishment for offenders, but sentence is preceded by trial before a tribunal of justice. There now exists the grandest tribunal ever instituted by man. It embodies all that is good and rejects all that is evil. It exists on the

assumption that nations are for the benefit of each other, and that their strength depends upon their ability to spread contentment and prosperity.

The International Court of Arbitration is the culmination of all advancement in the realm of jurisprudence. It makes war unnecessary and armaments a dead weight. In the justice it administers in its temple of peace across the waters the weakest principality comes with its grievance and stands out against the richest and most powerful. Prestige is set aside, history is forgotten, for the sake of administering a justice that has been trampled upon for centuries.

By all that is noble this court shall not cease its work. Supporting it is the popular sentiment of the masses of all nations. The diplomatic jargon can not close the ears of the rank and file of men. Politicians may rant and petty patriots grow vehement, but this court of arbitration is destined to soon shatter the great illusion that has no parallel among the artifices of the human mind.

Arbitration is holy, and its justification is the teaching of Jesus Christ, which clearly declares that no nation shall devote its faculties to infernal warfare. 'Tis tragic that some nations are still holing with a death-grip to the shot and shell and blood of a chaotic age, and stand under the black flag of violence which is moving to an exit where the light is dimmed forever. Others are at the verge of throwing aside their cumbersome implements of war. Who knows, but that Tennyson's "Parliament of Man" may be consummated even in our own generation, when power shall cease to be the arbiter and all battle flags shall be furled in the presence of the Goddess of Peace.

On a lonely Andean summit in South America stands a massive statue of Jesus of Nazareth. To the east stretches the land of Argentina, to the west the peaceful domains of Chile, whose peoples were once engaged in incessant warfare. At the base of the figure are these words, truly indicative of the growing brotherhood of nations: "Sooner shall these mountains crumble into dust than the Argentines and Chile-

ans break the peace to which they have pledged themselves at the feet of Christ the Redeemer."

"Oh, No! a thousand cheerful omens give
 Hope of still happier days whose dawn is nigh,
 He who has tamed the elements shall not live
 The slave of his own passion; he whose eye
 Unwinds the eternal dances of the sky
 And in the abyss of brightness dares to span
 The sun's broad circle; rising yet more high
 In God's magnificent works His will shall scan—
 And love and peace shall make their paradise with
 man."

JUDGE SPENCER:

Will the judges kindly come forward to the room prepared for them? We will now have a short recess, after which their decision will be announced.

(Recess.)

JUDGE SPENCER:

The judges request me to say in announcing their decision that they have had some difficulty in deciding, not so much as to the first man, for they rather all agreed upon him, but with regard to the second man it was quite a difficult matter for them to decide. I am very glad I didn't have it to decide. They have decided unanimously to award the first prize to Mr. John Leo Tierney, of St. Louis University (great applause)—if there is another individual in the room that would like to add to that—(laughter) and they have decided to award the second prize to Mr. Frank R. Birkhead, of William Jewell College. (Great applause.)

The meeting then adjourned.

ST. LOUIS UNIVERSITY

PEACE SERVICES, DISCOURSE BY ARCHBISHOP GLENNON

Wednesday Morning, April 30, at 9 o'clock

COLLEGE CHURCH

Educational institutions of St. Louis and throughout Missouri were requested by the program committee to hold appropriate exercises preceding the Peace Congress. The response by St. Louis University was in the form of one of the most notable of these preliminary meetings. The authorities of the University selected Wednesday morning for the time and the great College church for the gathering. Formal invitations were sent to alumni and friends of the institution to join the faculty and the student body in a solemn invocation of God's blessing on the Peace Movement.

By a happy coincident the time selected for this impressive demonstration was Rogation Day, one on which the Catholic Church throughout the world offers supplication for deliverance from various evils of which war comes in for mention by name.

The special Mass of the Roman Ritual for peace, "Pro Pace," was celebrated. The Very Reverend Bernard J. Otting, president of the University, officiated. Guests of honor were the Ministers from Washington and the resident Consuls of Latin-American nations, who were delegates or visitors to the Fourth American Peace Congress. They were escorted to the church and occupied front seats. The faculty, the students of the several departments, the alumni and the invited guests filled the great chancel. Gregorian music appropriate to the occasion was rendered by the choir of the Divinity Department.

His Grace, Archbishop John J. Glennon, occupied the Episcopal throne in the sanctuary until after the gospel, when he ascended the pulpit and delivered the address.

The Gospel of Peace

ARCHBISHOP JOHN J. GLENNON.

"Pax vobis—Peace be to you."

The history of humanity, as it has been so far popularly recorded is largely a history of warfare. Short and simple are the annals of the multitude; of the millions that have passed over the scene; but pointed and brilliant is the story of the world's heroes, its warriors and conquerors. Of the masses, how they lived, what they did, how they suffered, or what was the burden of their hopes, we have little record; whereas pages are given to an Alexander pausing for more worlds to conquer, or to a Cæsar returning in triumph from Gaul, or to a Napoleon leading veterans through fire and slaughter to the goal of his limitless ambition. The historians would make the pathway of humanity largely one of carnage and conquest, they would high-light the story of our race in the scarlet light of our brother's blood. And it is strange how kindly we have taken to the recital; there is something in the slaughter that appears to respond to something in the human heart. The man-fight and the bullfight are sure to draw the crowds; and people do not reason over it, they simply go, impelled by an attraction they may not explain. And from the history that has been written, the passing crowd today takes its individual hero worship; but all their heroes belong to the one type, the men, namely, who have fought and conquered or the men who have fought and fell.

Since pagan days there has been no philosophy for such deeds of violence as these, except indeed that the people liked it, or that they were compelled to resort to it because of the mingling of races barbarous with the civilized or the struggles of the strong to possess the lands of the weak. In these later years, however, the struggle appears to obtain its apology and its philosophy; so that the phenomenon, heretofore tolerated, now becomes a system, logically consonant at once with the needs and development of humanity. This philosophy is the theory of our modern sociologists who adopt and preach the materialistic view of history; who preach as true (what this

history of slaughter seems to confirm), namely, that men are, in their origin, no more than savage, and back of the savage, no more than the brute, and as it is natural for the brute to fight, so the savage will follow in his wake; and man with his added endowments, still savage in his origin, will make of killing a science in which he becomes, as the world advances more and more, an adept. This philosophy not only sets down warfare as the normal condition of humanity, but furthermore declares that it is the duty of each one to enter, if he would succeed; that his success depends upon the number he destroys; that the worst that can happen to him is to be conquered by the other, because in such a conquest he goes down a victim that begets no sympathy and a name whose memory is not worth the preserving. This is the philosophy whose dominant teaching is of what they call "the struggle of life" and "the survival of the fittest." I suppose the learned exponents of this teaching concerning material evolution as the law governing the history of our race may regard the interpretation presented as crude and exaggerated, if not untrue, yet I fail to see how it can be otherwise interpreted. The claim may be made that it is not a warfare by mode of slaughter, but it is warfare all the same; a struggle without pity, a struggle wherein no quarter may be given to the vanquished, where even the mantle of charity may not be spread over the fallen. And as a logical sequence, we find its latest development in the teaching of the "superman" who, by our more advanced writers today is held up as the highest product of that philosophy and the holiest expression of human progress.

But in the world of thought and action a change is gradually coming about. Militarists and their philosophers have overreached themselves; and standing armies and their cannon factories have grown to such proportions as to become a menace to the nation and to civilization. Other factors have arisen; other forces, heretofore regarded as negligible, are now asserting themselves. The war lord's word was formerly law, and his shrewd appeals to patriotism and national honor silenced all opposition and made, of even the most lethargic, frenzied fighters; but now the people themselves, formerly

regarded as subjects and slaves, are beginning to declare that when they fight they will want to know the reason why, and that reason must be more than the conceit or ambition of the war lord. They do not feel an obligation to go out to kill other people simply because of the war lord's commands. They do not see the necessity of taxing themselves in order to outdo some other nation in the number of their fighting men. They do not see how the manufacture of fourteen-inch guns contributes to the world's peace; nor do they claim it a logical condition to say that peace is promoted according to the size of the army or navy. They regard as sheer hypocrisy that a number of nations should each increase its armaments, and all of them claim they are doing so to promote peace. The truth of these preparations is that the war lords do not trust one another, and they use this specious argument to prepare for the emergencies which their mutual lack of confidence and sincerity produces.

Against all this democracy rises, and the rise of democracy is the death blow to militarism. Democracy stands for individual rights; militarism treats the people as a mob, who must be led, who may be taxed, and if they falter or fail in one or the other be rejected as unworthy the service of their masters. Not unworthy the service would they hold themselves, but unworthy of their manhood if they were to obey the call which is made, not because of their country's honor or its defense, but to gratify the lust of empire and the greed of extending power that animates their rulers.

Economics is opposed to warfare; democracy is opposed to warfare; humanity, conscious of its dignity, is opposed to bloodshed; lastly, and in principle more potent than all these, the Christian religion has ever stood for peace; has ever consulted its promotion; has ever decried the savagery of war. Long before our Blessed Saviour came to this world the prophets announced Him as the "Prince of Peace;" and the angel song at Christmas proclaimed at His coming: "Peace on earth, to men good will."

Who that has read the gospels, who that has followed the teachings of our Blessed Saviour but knows that the warfare that He inaugurated was not against humanity, but against

evil; that He came to save men, not to destroy them; that the only sword He would draw was that of the spirit; and the only enemy He would punish was the one who stood against humanity and against God. Did He not tell St. Peter to put up the sword, for they who drew the sword would perish by it? Did He not proclaim men His brothers, and dying leave them that legacy of peace, "My peace I leave to you, My peace I give to you?" Was it not His salutation to His brethren when He appeared to them; and was it not the salutation He wished to be used by those who would be His apostles and followers in all times? So it becomes the salutation of His coming, His testament when leaving and His promise to His children to all times; not alone for time, but for eternity as well. For that eternity, He held out to them the kingdom of eternal peace.

There be those who claim that if this be the gospel of the Christ, it has been poorly preached, if preached at all, by the Church, Christian and Catholic; for they say, during all these years that the Church has had among its honored sons those who fought, as well as those who prayed; and that the burden of the Middle Ages, for instance, is largely one of warfare between family and family—Bishop and Baron—Pope and Kaiser; to which I say, I am compelled to admit that the charge is partly true in fact; but that in principle, the Church has never wavered from her trust, and that trust included in her gospel the inculcation of "Peace and Good Will." We must remember that the Church in the early day was not the aggressor, that it was Paganism and the power of pagan Rome that was bent on her destruction, and that she had to receive the dagger point and be permitted not even to wear a breast-plate for her defense. And that again when the power of pagan Rome and her martial spirit declined, there came those other pagans, the nations from the North, believing their duty to be to seize and destroy nations that lived by the sword, whose gospel was that of bloodshed. The Church might cry to such as these, "peace—peace!" but there was no peace. And yet, while these ages are replete with torture and death, the Church with what power she had did proclaim and command allegiance to the Gospel of Peace; her councils and her pontiffs hurled anathemas on unjust wars and warfare. If she was

unable to overcome the spirit of war in its entirety, she would set limitations upon its activities. The "Treuga Dei," the "truce of God," was solemnly proclaimed, whereby contending armies must cease from warfare from Saturday until Monday, saving, at least, the Lord's Day from witnessing their brutality; then extending it to the Fridays of the week, then making Advent and Lent privileged times; so that the days and times made sacred by the Passion and Death of our Lord might put a quietus on the passions of men and the death of their brethren. And again the Church proclaimed the "privilege of the sanctuary," whereby she would release certain persons and render immune certain places from having their door-posts marked with blood. The enemy might retreat thereto and be safe; and from the enemy within to the enemy without the message of peace could be borne, and they who bore it were under the Church's protection. So that though there be dark deeds done and battles fought throughout these years, yet there is the counterpart in the Church's ministrations where, over against the blood-red tide of battle were set the white walls of the city of God. The great mediator of these ages was the vicar of Christ. The great court of arbitration was that over which the Pontiff presided.

And today the Church still preaches its Gospel of Peace—still proclaims that nations, at least, that claim to be Christian, should not indulge in the unholy work of slaughtering one another—that if wars are to be, in so far as these nations are concerned, they should not be wars of aggression. She proclaims peace with honor (that honor is sufficiently asserted when we defend our own). A mission we have to the world of paganism, it is true, and that mission is one of the Cross and not one of the sword. A mission we have to humanity; but that is one of love and not of hatred. Our Catholic faith applauds no nation when that nation knows not the rights of others. Our Church teaches patriotism, but she has no admiration for Chauvinist or Jingo. We preach the democracy of Christ; in Him and through Him our conquests should be over sin and sorrow and death. Our leader Christ; our oriflamme the Cross; our country, for the time, the one we love and will serve; our country in eternity, the Kingdom of God.

AMERICAN SCHOOL PEACE LEAGUE

SPECIAL MEETING FOR TEACHERS

Wednesday Evening, April 30, at 8 o'clock

SOLDAN HIGH SCHOOL

BEN BLEWETT, SUPERINTENDENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION, Presiding

MR. BLEWETT:

Several years ago, in an address before the Virginia Society, our now President of the United States, in extolling the virtues of man, asked why it was that the sword and the old musket were given places of honor above the mantelpiece, but never the yardstick. The willingness to surrender one's life for the things that one thinks is noble is the supremest test of devotion, but the willingness to take life in order to lay hold of those things which selfishness reaches out for is the ignoblest quality of man's nature. We believe that our schoolhouses should be a temple of peace, and every teacher should be a teacher of the Gospel of Peace, and in this belief some of the teachers of this great republic are banding together in the different states, the cities and smaller communities, into a league, in the determination that as opportunity may be offered they will preach the Gospel of Peace to the young people who are under their influence. In this belief this School Peace League has marched forward already to eminent success, but it will not stop in its endeavors until it has enrolled an army under its flag the vast majority of the men and women teachers of the children, and the children themselves of our elementary and higher schools, and certainly the men and women of the great universities of the land.

It is our very great privilege tonight to be able to listen to President Thwing, of Western Reserve University, who will speak of the purposes of the great universities in this direction. President Thwing.

Education for Rational Internationalism

PRESIDENT CHARLES F. THWING.

This place is sacred to me. The name that this great building bears is a name to inspire every heart that loves its kind, a name honored wherever known, and known among the higher people of this great republic. I am also glad to speak in this place by reason of my friendship and respect for the honored principal of this school. A great school system demands a great principal and the need is met in the master of this great undertaking.

Tonight I shall detain you only a short time, because a richer and larger pleasure awaits you, but I do desire to speak upon the subject outlined in the courteous words of the generous chairman, upon higher education in relation to what may be called the whole rational international movement. That movement is in part rational, in part irrational, but the rational part of it is coming more and more to dominate and to command all interests. Education itself is coming to be a commanding interest in the republic. Therefore, the question I wish to ask is: What is the relation of the higher education to this great rational movement for international relations? I think we can reach our basis for this best by trying to interpret what education is. Manifold are the definitions, and I shall not burden you with some new, technical interpretations. But there are three general interpretations to education that have a bearing upon our great subject.

Education represents inheritance, the transmission of the knowledge and the understanding of the past into the present age. It represents all that can be known of the past, received by ourselves of today. There are four mighty influences that we have received in this modern world.

One is the Greek, a movement standing for culture, for appreciation of beauty and for the sense of the fitness of things. It is embodied in noble architecture. The Parthenon is the supreme flower. It is embodied in great poems, in noble histories, in fundamental, deep tragedies. Homer, Demosthenes, Sophocles, are included in this movement. Whether knowing or not knowing that language, we know that Greek has influ-

enced the republic and every citizen of it in ways unconscious to himself.

And also we have received that mighty influence that goes with the name Roman, an influence more visible, more evident than the Greek influence, that stands for law, for government, for the republic, for the living of men together under statute and common law.

And a third influence we have received, called the great name Hebrew. It stands for religion. It has come to us through Jesus Christ, and through the Christian Scriptures, and whether one reads only the Old Testament or the New, that word Hebrew stands for religion in its largest, widest depths, a higher relation, and represents a mighty power in the republic and the heart of the individual.

An influence, too, which we have received, unlike the Hebrew and the Roman and the Greek, is the German influence, from more than a thousand years ago; the Teutonic influence that came down from the north into Italy, that came across from Germany into England, that influence that has given us our principle of liberty. Hidden, away back in those German forests in the marshes of the Rhone and the Rhine, they worked out for the first time those great principles of liberty which Jefferson wrote a thousand years after in his immortal instrument.

These four principles, standing for appreciation, for government, for religion, and for liberty, are four inheritances that we have received that help to constitute education, and the man who has these in his own soul is the man who is educated.

But, also, my friends, education stands for thinking. Some might say that education stands for learning. Learning has its chief value in education as learning is thinking. The human mind is not educated that is crammed with knowledge, as a library, or collection of facts, but the mind is educated that is intelligent, that has power, that discriminates, and does its proper work properly; a mind thinking, a mind seeing, judging, reasoning, comparing, and concluding, a mind weighing evidence, assessing truth at a just value, and comparing truth

with truth and drawing out new truth. That is education; and by the way, in passing, I might say the education of thinking is the education that is primary to the higher world. I asked one of three men in all the world who know most about making steel: "What," said I, "is the lack of the men who come to you asking for work?" From the man who has built steel mills in Sheffield came the answer, "Power to think." Again he said, "I can find a thousand men who can take my ideas and work them over, but to find a man who can think for me is the man I am looking for and can not find." The man who thinks in high school, in college, in university, is the man educated.

Let me also say that after all, as I have intimated, education is not an abstract thing. Education is the man educated. If we could get a man educated, we should have education indeed. If we could take the highest inheritance and the richest qualities out of many men and put them all together, what a tremendous power the resulting man would be. If you could take the patient observation of Charles Darwin, plus the intellectual analysis and power of John Stuart Mill, plus the efficient power of Thomas H. Huxley, plus the poetic delineation of Tennyson, plus the interpretation of Browning, plus the trust in human nature of Abraham Lincoln, plus the comprehensive knowledge of William E. Gladstone, what a man would be the result! What vision, what affluence of power! What earnestness and zeal! What mighty achievement of soul and character! That same result represents the comprehensiveness of education. But now my little talk changes.

Education standing for the inheritance of a noble past, standing for the power of thinking, standing for the largest and most complete type of the educated man, education has a mighty relation in promoting the causes of the international movement. For, given a man who has received unto himself the sense of appreciation of the Greek, the quality of power and of obedience of the Roman, the religion of the Hebrew, and the sense of liberty of the Teuton, that man has a mighty power to interpret life in the far East and the near West, in the near East and the far West. The man of that type can

see and discriminate, and can be the largest man because his character lies four-square. The man who is a thinker is the international man who settles disputes, who adjusts differences between nations. It is not the man who has his eye fixed inward only. It is the man whose eye is always outward, whose vision is like the compass; the man who can put himself in the other man's place, seeing out of his eyes, hearing out of his ears, feeling in his heart as the other man; the man who can think is the man who can avoid international difficulties or who, when they do occur, is the most potent power in their settlement. Not the man of power and character, however surpassing the significance of character is, but the man who can think is the man to be entrusted with international questions. The man of a complete education, the man as large as Gladstone, as true as Lincoln, as keen as John Stuart Mill, as patient as Charles Darwin, this is the man to administer the great international concerns of men. Therefore I say, my friends, that education has a mighty and a close relationship to the international movement, for education trains a man in himself to have large, four-square power. Education trains a man to discriminate, to judge, and to think. Education makes the complete man, to administer complex and great questions. (Applause.)

MR. BLEWETT:

We are assembled here in the quiet of these surroundings tonight, but at this time possibly forces are coming together at the head of the Adriatic Sea that shall result in an explosion that will set the world afire. As we in the quiet here are preaching the Gospel of Peace, we may be standing upon the very edge of a conflict unequaled in the history of the world for the forces involved and the destruction that will be wrought. Think of the young men of Europe, possibly marching forward tomorrow into the jaws of death and giving up their lives for what? Some great principle of truth that should be struggled for or obeying the behest of some proud human thought that will not bend in arbitration, leading to the sacrifice of thousands of men? God grant that it may not be true. But should it come about in this way, think of those other

sacrifices of the women at home who have surrendered these men,—brother, husband, and sweetheart,—that pride may be upheld. Is it not a great work for the women of the world to stand together in the preaching of peace? In our own land the women have put their best energies, many of them, to this great work, and it is our great pleasure to have with us tonight one of the women who in America and Europe has stood for peace. Mrs. Andrews is known to many of us in St. Louis. To those of you who have not heard her before, I have the great pleasure of offering this treat this evening. Mrs. Fannie Fern Andrews, Secretary of the School Peace League. (Applause.)

Organization Work for International Peace in the Public Schools

MRS. FANNIE FERN ANDREWS.

In 1908 began the first organized attempt to promote the peace idea in the public schools. Through the formation of the American School Peace League, which was the outcome of the Young People's Meeting of the First National Peace Congress in 1907, a group of educators joined together to inform themselves on the principles and facts of the peace movement and to devise methods of teaching pupils how to solve international problems by just and peaceful means. The importance of this effort is well brought out in the words of Superintendent Maxwell, who presided at the Young People's Meeting. He said: "If peace is in the end to triumph over war, it must be chiefly through the instrumentality of those who are now in the schools, and their successors who will soon be called upon to take up their tasks in the world's work."

Certainly the culmination of the movement for international co-operation lies in the hands of future generations, and it obviously follows that on their attitude depends the consummation of law, which will give assurance of permanent international peace. Theirs will constitute the public opinion of the future, which will regulate international action. The farsighted policy of the peace movement today, therefore, is to train up a body of opinion which will recognize the efficiency of legislative and judicial procedure in the constantly increas-

ing relations among the nations of the world. Such is the plan of the American School Peace League.

This association, which even at the beginning represented every state in the Union, has extended its organization through the medium of the State Branch. The League has now thirty-five of these Branches, most of which have been formed in connection with the State Teachers' Association. Their annual meetings are held at the time of the state conventions, and many of the State Teachers' Associations give the State School Peace League a place on their programs. Several have made the State Branch of the League a regular department of the State Teachers' Association. The ultimate aim of organization is to make the State Branch of the League a corporate part of the State Teachers' Association.

A distinctive feature of some of the branches is the organization of local peace leagues,—in counties, high and normal schools and colleges. There are at the present time, thirty-five such branches. These are designated as branches or chapters of the State Branch. These leagues have regular meetings, and in many cases provide the Peace Day exercises for the school or college. They also stimulate orations and the writing of essays on international peace.

Previous to the 18th of May, many of the state secretaries sent circulars to the daily press, to the educational magazines of their states, and to the superintendents, outlining the aims of the International Peace movement, and urging the observance of the 18th of May. The branches have been vigilant also in procuring peace literature for school, college and public libraries. Through their influence several of the State Library Commissions have recommended placing peace literature in libraries. The state secretaries have distributed many of the printed lists of literature, which have been supplied from the central office, and have awakened interest not only among teachers but among people in general.

Specifically the League has three objects:

1. To acquaint the teachers of the United States with the movement for promoting a better understanding among the peoples of different nations.

2. To prepare material which will enable teachers to make appropriate applications to the specific work of the school.

3. To secure the interest of teachers in all countries in the movement for international co-operation, so that the youth of all nations may be trained simultaneously to recognize the reasonableness of international co-operation.

Teachers are reached through teachers' conventions, teachers' institutes, and summer schools; through the educational press; and through the circulation of publications bearing on the international peace movement. At least two-thirds of the State Teachers' Associations, the American Institute of Instruction, the Southern Educational Association and the National Education Association have seriously discussed the relation of the international movement to teaching, and have passed notable resolutions in support.

The annual conventions of the League have been held respectively in Denver, Boston, San Francisco and Chicago. The Fifth Annual Convention is to be held in Salt Lake City in July, 1913.

Some of the large summer schools of the country, composed almost wholly of teachers, have given lecture courses on the international peace movement and have distributed large quantities of literature. It is fair to assume that through the educational press of the United States the teachers of every state have had their attention called to the work of the League. During the past five years about five hundred thousand pamphlets, touching different phases of the international movement, have been distributed among teachers. The International Conciliation Association and the World Peace Foundation have generously supplied the League with literature. The latter, at the request of the League, sends a package to every peace prize contestant, and also to every teacher desiring material for the observance of the 18th of May.

The League realizes that its function is not only to interest teachers, but to supply them with definite material for use in the classroom. In several directions, the League is making a study of the methods by which its ideas may be incorporated in the course of study.

The committee on history has made a wide investigation of the status of history teaching in the United States. The report of this committee shows that "there is evidence that in some school systems much time is devoted to the study of (1) such useless details as unimportant dates and statistical matter; (2) the complex principles underlying the organization and evolution of political parties; and (3) battles and military campaigns." The committee points out that "while the history committee of the American School Peace League regrets the time wasted in all the ways just enumerated, it wishes to call special attention to the over-emphasis given by our public schools to political and military history. Inasmuch as the state is the most complex of all the institutions established by human society, in putting an over-emphasis on the political side of life, the schools are trying to teach what the pupil is not ready to understand, and are failing to give proper consideration to such cases of institutional life as he can understand and what it is far more important for him to know. But by far the greatest waste in history teaching results from the excessive and disproportionate amount of time which is spent in the study of wars. Of course, wars should be studied and they should receive much attention because they have played an important part in both racial and national evolution, but such study should not involve the teaching of the military minutiae of campaigns and battles." The demand that history taught to pupils shall describe the evolution of a people in all its important aspects means a marked change, not only in teaching history, but in the writing of history text-books. The committee is now preparing a manual on the teaching of history, which will include a model course of study with detailed and explicit suggestions for the teacher.

In 1910 the committee on methods of the Massachusetts Branch of the American School Peace League was appointed to work out a plan by which teachers can advance the object of the League. In its first deliberations, the committee recognized that such a plan must deal with the problem of citizenship, since it is the action of citizens which governs the movement for international justice and fraternity. To define the principles of citizenship applicable to the promotion of the

international spirit, and the method of inculcating an appreciation of the duties and obligations implied therein, became the first work of the committee.

It was agreed that good-will is the fundamental principle underlying international harmony, and that consequently the inculcation of this idea should form the fundamental basis of any plan which the committee might work out. If we can arouse the spirit of good-will in children through all the years of school, we shall be working directly for peace among the nations. Good-will in little children expresses itself through kindness and helpfulness at home and in school, and loyalty to these simple ties can spread circle by circle in the child's growth till it reaches the goal of good-will among all men.

To teach good-will as an abstract ideal, however, is not the aim of the committee. The aim is rather to promote action, prompted by an appreciation of the obligations of a citizen who takes his part in the development of modern civilization. Definite action is the key-note of the plan.

As soon as a child is old enough to be conscious of ties outside his own being, he begins his life as a member of society, with duties and obligations. These outside relations form the incipient beginnings of citizenship. A child is a little citizen in his own sphere, which gradually widens until he assumes the functions of a citizen in its broad sense. His first consciousness of relation to others develops in his contact with home life; his next important activity concerns himself as a member of the school; then as a member of his city and state; as a citizen of his country; and finally as a member of the larger social group, the world.

The committee has prepared a course in citizenship which is designed to cover the first eight grades of school. The early grades are devoted to the ties of home life; the next proceed with the school and the playground; then the city and state; the nation; and the world. The course leads the pupil into the study of international rights and obligations. He is taught to appreciate other peoples and other civilizations, and to understand the special mission of the United States in world progress.

The committee is now collecting suitable material for each grade from history, literature, geography, and civics to illustrate these lessons. Such material will be printed in book form, one for each grade of school, together with the full outline for all the grades.

The League recommends, as a particularly fitting method for inculcating the idea of international friendliness, the observance in the schools of the anniversary of the opening of the First Hague Conference, the 18th of May. Last year, at the request of United States Commissioner of Education, the Secretary of the League prepared material for the observance of the 18th of May. This was published as a Bulletin of the Federal Bureau of Education, and was called for to the extent of about fifty thousand copies. This year the Secretary has compiled another Peace Day Bulletin, much larger and more comprehensive, which is again published by the Federal Bureau of Education. Many school boards have ordered a sufficient number of these Bulletins to supply their teachers, and it is expected that the edition this year will reach a hundred thousand.

The League's third line of action is its effort to secure the interest of teachers in all countries in the movement for international co-operation. Following the three European trips of the Secretary, plans have proceeded in the formation of an International Council of Education. These plans, however, have developed in a new direction during the past year. To many people, the organization of an International Council of Education seemed such an important matter, possessed of such great opportunities for the advancement of education in general, that it seemed wise to make this a governmental affair. As such, it will embody the whole range of educational problems. The plan proposed is to hold an international conference on education which shall have two objects: first, to discuss educational questions which are of common interest to the educators of different nations; and second, to organize a permanent International Council of Education.

At the request of the American School Peace League, United States Commissioner Claxton presented the matter to the Department of State, and at the suggestion of the United

States Government, the Dutch Government has invited the nations to participate in a conference to convene at The Hague in September, 1913. Our Government has accepted the invitation, and has submitted the following tentative program :

1. A method by which the standard educational literature in different countries may be made accessible to teachers of other countries.

2. The international exchange of university professors, public school teachers and students, as a method of becoming acquainted with the life and institutions of other countries.

3. Principles of citizenship which may be taught as common to all countries.

4. Instruction in foreign languages.

5. The training of teachers.

6. The relation of the home and the school.

7. Co-education.

8. The relation of teachers' associations to school authorities.

9. Problems relating to school hygiene.

10. The teaching of history.

11. Vocational education.

The vocational aim in education.

Continuation schools.

Agricultural education.

12. Cosmopolitan clubs in colleges.

13. The organization of a permanent International Council of Education.

The International Council of Education will have two main functions :

1. To offer a means by which the educational authorities in one country may be kept abreast of the educational progress in other countries, serving in this capacity as a bureau of exchange and also as a bureau for the translation and exchange of standard educational literature. To make the bureau efficient and authentic, permanent committees of investigation and research should be constantly at work.

2. To arrange biennial or triennial conferences on education.

This educational conference and the permanent International Council of Education will not only make for the uplift of education, but for a spirit of union among the peoples. The coming together of the representatives of the nations will result in a common knowledge of the purposes which each nation has at heart, for through the educational system of a country one can understand its ideals. It can not be doubted that a systematic effort to understand one another educationally will foster mutual respect and good-will among the nations. The International Council of Education will, therefore, be a substantial contribution to the effort to secure the peace of the world.

The American School Peace League stands for citizenship, consistent with the ideals of international comity, and it seeks the support of every teacher in the world. A measurable period of scientific, vigorous activity, as outlined in the plans of the League, would produce a state of mind throughout the world which would make international war impossible, and would produce standards in education consistent with the highest development of the human race.

MR. BLEWETT:

We people assembled here tonight are in the distinguished position of acting as the preliminary meeting of the Fourth American Peace Congress, which assembles this week in our city.

You have in your hands, I presume, the program for all of these meetings. If you have had opportunity to look them over you understand how rich a treat is offered to the citizens of St. Louis in the subjects of the program and the men and women who are to speak upon these subjects. I am permitted to extend from this platform the invitation that has been extended cordially through the newspapers, an invitation to the citizens to be present at any and all of these meetings which they may be able to attend. Our city has, I think, a great opportunity to show its interest in a movement which is bound to exert a great influence on the future life of the world.

THE CONGRESS

FIRST GENERAL SESSION

ADDRESSES OF CHAIRMAN SMITH, GOVERNOR MAJOR, MAYOR KIEL,
ANDREW CARNEGIE, PRESIDENT BARTHOLDT and DR. TRUEBLOOD

Thursday Morning, May 1, at 10 o'clock.

THE ODEON

HON. RICHARD BARTHOLDT, Presiding

A voluntary on the grand organ preceded the formal opening of the Congress. James E. Smith, former president of The Business Men's League, chairman of the Executive Committee of the Congress, called the delegates to order.

MR. SMITH:

Our Distinguished Guests, the Honorable Delegates, Ladies and Gentlemen:—As a citizen of St. Louis, I am proud of this large gathering of distinguished people from all parts of the Western Hemisphere who have honored us with their presence on this important and memorable occasion. It seems to me a hopeful augury that so large an assemblage of earnest, thoughtful people have thus come together for the purpose of furthering a cause which should appeal to every humane human being.

It is fitting and appropriate that the opening of this Fourth American Peace Congress in St. Louis should so closely follow the celebration of yesterday over the dedication of the Memorial to Thomas Jefferson, in commemoration of the purchase of the Louisiana Territory, in that the acquisition of that extensive domain secured from France by Jefferson, was one of the greatest transfers of territory recorded in history and that this great transaction was accomplished entirely through peaceful methods, thus demonstrating the force and truth of

Milton's immortal statement, "Peace hath her victories no less renowned than war."

Universal peace has been dreamed of and desired by enlightened people since the world began, and happily there is now an insistent demand for it which is becoming world wide, and through the organized and persistent effort that is now being made by the lovers of peace throughout the world this demand is growing in strength from day to day.

America should be the loyal leader in this glorious cause, and let us hope that this Fourth American Peace Congress may give a fresh impetus to this laudable movement that will encourage the people of other nations to increase their efforts and that all may work together hand in hand and speed the coming of that peaceful, happy era when

"Each man finds his own in all men's good.
And all men work in noble brotherhood."

It is not my function to deliver an address upon any of the subjects which will engage the attention of this Congress, and my remarks will therefore be becomingly brief. As Chairman of the Executive Committee, to whom was assigned the task of organizing this Congress, it now becomes my pleasant duty to open its proceedings by presenting to you the gentleman who has been selected to act as its president and presiding officer. He is a distinguished citizen of St. Louis, and owing to his earnest efforts in behalf of international peace and arbitration he is well known to the advocates of peace in all civilized countries.

Ladies and Gentlemen: It affords me great pleasure to present to you the Honorable Richard Bartholdt.

PRESIDENT BARTHOLDT:

Distinguished Guests, Ladies and Gentlemen: The call to the Presidency of this assembly is an honor which I deeply feel and for which adequately to express my gratitude I am utterly unable. I shall have a few words to say to you later on in the proceedings. For the present the Honorable Daniel S. Tuttle, Bishop of Missouri, will offer the invocation.

The Invocation

BISHOP DANIEL S. TUTTLE.

I should be glad if you will kindly join your voices with mine in the Lord's Prayer at the close. Let us pray.

Almighty God, Our Heavenly Father, who art the God of peace, we invoke Thy gracious favor and Thy divine guidance for this meeting of the Fourth American Peace Congress. Grant to us, we beseech Thee, Thy love and mercy and help. Enlighten our minds more and more with the light of Thy everlasting gospel, proclaimed on the Savior's birthday of old as "Glory to God in the highest," with the added glad tidings of "Peace on earth, good will to men."

Send down to us Thy holy spirit and inspire our thoughts and words and acts and lives. Tell us whither we are to go and what we are to do and how we are to keep our feet in the way of peace. Awake and sustain and strengthen in all the world the forces that make for peace. Incline our hearts to look away from the counted strength of our armaments and to look rather to the greater strength of him who is called, "Wonderful Counselor, the Mighty God, the Everlasting Father and the Prince of Peace." Direct us, O Lord, in all our doings, especially in the thoughts and plans and counsels and deliberations of this Congress, with Thy most gracious favor and further us with Thy continual help that in all our works begun, continued and ended in Thee we may glorify Thy holy name and finally by Thy mercy obtain everlasting life through Jesus Christ, our Lord, in whose name and in whose own words we sum up these, our prayers.

[The delegates, standing, joined in the Lord's Prayer.]

PRESIDENT BARTHOLDT:

Ladies and Gentlemen: Missouri is humorously called "The Show-me State." I hope that this Congress, by its intelligent advocacy of the great cause of peace will succeed in showing her. But I believe we can do so. There is a gentleman here who wishes to show you first. He is, by virtue of his high office, the "War Lord of Missouri," the commander-in-

chief of the army and navy of this great state. It is a privilege and an honor to introduce to you the Hon. Elliott W. Major, Governor of Missouri.

Welcome to the State

HON. ELLIOTT W. MAJOR, GOVERNOR OF MISSOURI.

Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen: This affords me a great deal of pleasure inasmuch as I am the commander-in-chief of the army of the state and of its navy. (Laughter.) Merely looking at me would at once satisfy you that I am not belligerent and there are few people in this country to whom I give any trouble any way.

I am glad to see the ladies present, and as delegates, because from actual experience I find that they are always first in war (laughter), first in peace and first in the hearts of the gentlemen. (Applause.)

You are starting under most favorable auspices, and I have a reason for saying that. Last fall I opened my campaign for Governor in this building. (Applause.) I have not had the pleasure of coming since within these walls until this morning; as we then began a campaign for civic achievements and for peace which resulted in the largest plurality ever given a candidate for any office in the State of Missouri, I know at the beginning that your work will succeed. (Applause.)

Now, my friends, I am glad to have this pleasure of welcoming you to the greatest city of the greatest state of the greatest republic of all times. (Applause.) Why, Missouri is the first state in the Union, and always the first in all achievements. In fact, it is conceded that it is the state unequaled in the girdle of the globe. We have here the most hospitable people, the finest climate, the purest water, the richest plains and valleys and the greatest wealth in minerals, in orchards and in timber, the sweetest children, and the handsomest women and the homeliest men that ever walked. (Applause.)

I am glad to welcome you as men and women engaged in a great work on the humanitarian side of life. It is said, and truly so, that "peace rules the day when reason rules the mind."

Therefore, let us reason together at this conference and remember that education is civilization. Civilization is a peace-maker, and the Master tells us, "Blessed are the peace-makers, for they shall be called the children of God." (Applause.)

Today, my friends, we draw wisdom from the centuries and we now stand in the theater of a new epoch. The curtain is rising upon the new play and the new scenes; let there then be peace among all the nations of the earth, peace at any cost, even if we must fight for it. (Applause and laughter.)

My friends, let me say you begin your work in the greatest republic and in a country that is the richest by two-fold of any nation beneath the sun; a country stronger in its citizenship, stronger in its defense of inalienable rights, and more formidably intrenched by reason of its commercial aggrandizement than by reason of its frowning ships, embattled walls and panoplies of war. (Applause.)

The victories of peace, let us grasp it, are more lasting and greater far than the brilliant pageantry of martial splendor; the hum of commercial energy is sweeter than the rattle of arms, and the product of industry more glorious than the golden sunlight upon embattled thousands.

It has been ninety-nine years since there was a war between English-speaking peoples. It has been ninety-eight years since there was war between France and an English-speaking nation. It has been one hundred and fifty years since there was war between England and Germany, and never has there been strife between America and Germany.

My friends, we have learned then for a century that the differences between nations, both great and small, can be settled by and through diplomacy and arbitrament which are at hand. (Applause.) Now then, with this kindergarten experience in the school of peace may we not go forth to the future and make this realm eternal?

My friends, I am glad that you have the opportunity to let you lay the foundation here that will later establish a court and tribunal which may be ratified in 1915 by the Hague meeting and establish for all the nations a place where they can go

and honestly and honorably submit and settle all their matters in peaceful conference. (Applause.)

Then, my friends, in this enlightened age, the twentieth century, the greatest in the history of all the nations of all the earth, let it be practically a Second Coming. Then, may we beat the swords into ploughshares and may our armaments be woven into rails and moulded into engines drawing the commerce of the civilized nations of the earth. (Applause.)

It affords me great pleasure to welcome especially our distinguished guest, Mr. Carnegie, to this state. (Applause.) In war matters he and I are placed in the same class. We are feather weights. (Laughter.) He has devoted his life for a set purpose, that of bringing about a world-wide peace, and has given eleven million dollars of his personal fortune to bring it about. I am glad you realize the fact, Mr. Carnegie, that it is well to give fortunes for so great and so laudable a purpose, for after a while the money does not make so much difference; it is immaterial. Our homes may glitter with regal splendor. We may own the fertile fields rich with the husbandry of man and laden with the product of his toil; we may own the horses feeding upon ten thousand hills as they shake their sleek sides in the sunlight of God, but if we have not love for our fellow man and for our nation, then, my friends, we are even poorer than the beggar in the street who solicits alms from the passer-by.

Realize the fact, as does Mr. Carnegie, that after a while there will come a time when the acts of men will pass in review, and be judged not according to golden ducats and shining raiment, not according to silken banners and scrolls of fame, but by the blessings we have brought to others and the good deeds we have done on earth and the temples we have builded in the hearts of men. (Applause.)

Again, my friends, I thank you for this great opportunity of welcoming to the State of Missouri this great and laudable work, these splendid men and women engaged in so noble a cause. The day is both propitious and opportune. After a while you will gather the sheaves from a righteous cause. I thank you. (Applause.)

PRESIDENT BARTHOLDT:

St. Louis' hospitality is proverbial and is known the country over from "Hell-gate" to "Golden Gate." The people of St. Louis have a peculiar knack of always selecting as their chief magistrate a man who is especially competent to properly extend her hospitality. I take great pleasure in presenting to you the Honorable Henry W. Kiel, Mayor of the City of St. Louis. (Applause.)

Welcome to the City of St. Louis

HON. HENRY W. KIEL, MAYOR.

Mr. President, Delegates of the Peace Congress, Ladies and Gentlemen: When I look over this peaceful gathering I can not help but feel that St. Louis should be proud of the fact that you have selected it as your meeting place. (Applause.) We are proud of St. Louis and I am glad to be here this morning to extend to you a hearty welcome. We want you to feel that St. Louis is yours during your stay. We extend to you our hospitality and we want you to avail yourselves of it, so that when you leave here and go back to your homes you will sing our praises. We have many beautiful sights that will interest you. I hope during your stay you will look at our beautiful residence districts; that you will ride through our parks, and that you will visit our public buildings. I know that when you see what we have accomplished you will feel as proud of the fact that you are here as we will that you have been here.

Our worthy governor told you many things about the State of Missouri, but if it was not for the fact that the City of St. Louis is located in the State of Missouri, Missouri would not amount to so much. (Applause.) We are going to keep it that way. (Applause.) The purpose for which you are gathered together here is one in which we are all deeply interested. My troubles during my administration will be great. I only wish that I would be able, when they get very bad, to call a peace congress of this nature so that I would have this spirit. (Applause.)

Now, my good friends, have a good time while you are here. Everything is yours. Enjoy it as well as you can. I do not believe that your visit will be entirely complete unless you come down and pay the Mayor a visit at his office. I thank you. (Applause.)

PRESIDENT BARTHOLDT:

Ladies and Gentlemen: Goethe said, "Man is but an animal with a soul." If that is true, we friends of peace have the right to claim that the appeal of the militarists is to the animal and the appeal of the peace advocates to the soul of man. (Applause.) Victor Hugo expressed that same sentiment in a different strain. He said, "Peace is the virtue and war the crime of civilization." (Applause.)

If that be true, and unquestionably it is true, then every man and woman who promotes the cause of peace is a benefactor of the human race, and one of the greatest benefactors of that character, one whose generous hand always responds to the warm impulses of a good heart, is our honored guest today. (Applause.)

It is my honor to introduce to you the Honorable Andrew Carnegie. (Prolonged applause.)

The Baseless Fear of War

ANDREW CARNEGIE.

The peace conference meets today in the metropolis of the Southwest for the first time. I venture to prophecy it will not be the last. Perhaps the next time we may meet to celebrate the great triumph for which we labor. I can not imagine a more appropriate place than St. Louis for that great event. I hope I may be right.

Your cordial reception makes us all feel quite at home here among you already and all glad to be here with you. Our last National Congress, as you may remember, adjourned after a stormy session debating the subject of naval armament. The army was also heard from. The Secretary of War proposed merging the militia with the regular army, adding largely to our cost. Little do our people realize the cost of what is called

national defense against imaginary foes of unduly frightened army and navy officials, jogging along their peaceful lives and spending their days dreaming of active life which they are never destined to experience.

Not one admiral or captain, not one officer in our army and navy was ever engaged in war, ever fired a hostile shot, if we except the skirmish involved by our taking Texas from the Mexicans and our little unpleasantness with Spain over Cuba.

No nation has ever attacked us. We have always been the attacker. We declared war in 1812. We attacked Mexico and we again attacked Spain. No nation has attacked us to date, and no nation can successfully invade us. (Applause.) If a man wishes to select the safest life possible, the one freest from all danger of violent death, let him enter our army or navy. (Laughter and applause.) There is not a workman attending machinery or erecting buildings, or a railway train employe, or a policeman, the soldier of civilization whose duty is never to attack but always to protect, not one but runs far greater risk of accident, injury or death than the soldier, the marine, the admiral or the general of our country does today. (Applause.) So much for the heroic value of war. There is little danger of any of these gentlemen ever seeing war, thank God! They will only have to parade. (Laughter.) The chivalry and heroism of war, if any ever truly existed, is gone.

Shooting from a warship to the sea coast ten miles distant, shooting under cover at a foe always under cover, or shooting at a foe one mile distant, is not conducive to the heroic. (Laughter and applause.) Did you get that? (Laughter and applause.) Our War and Navy departments have no basis for any fears of attack in the slightest, based on any reasonable judgment. We have still with us General Miles, Lieutenant General, who expelled Spain from Cuba, now dispelling the groundless fears of possible attack. He has recently told us Great Britain—and I quote from the General whom I have the great pleasure of knowing well—"Great Britain controls fifty-two per cent of the ocean commerce of the world and yet it took her a good part of one year to transport an army of

two hundred thousand men to the coast of Africa where the opponent had not a single vessel to intercept or oppose the movement!" Our foremost military authority, General Miles, thus warns his country against the crime of jingoism, saying: "I trust that our patriotic people and nation may be unmoved by jingoism. The history of our world shows that some nations pour all their male population into the parts of a great military machine, burdening their people and exhausting their national resources simply for the aggrandizement of some war lord or imperial despot or to protect their country from the menace of some similar power. But for the United States, so far removed from the scene of conflict to follow such an example would be a national crime. (Applause.) Un-American, it would violate every tradition and principle that we have maintained for more than a hundred years. (Applause.) It would be putting a dangerous power into the hands of some ambitious upstart or usurper of the future."

Those last words I have reason to attach more importance to than perhaps one man in a thousand here. I know how near we were to the source of danger—from this very source. Such is the opinion of an experienced leader, soldier, who has led our army to war. Oh, little do our people know the cost of defense against imaginary foes. I wish I could induce the two speakers, the governor and the mayor, who have the faculty of reaching the masses—I wish I could—well, let them fix their own salary and go around and talk to the people as I believe they would if they knew the true condition.

Listen and ponder over this: The army estimates for this year are one hundred and fifty millions of dollars, I omit the odd figures; navy estimates, one hundred and fifty-four millions of dollars. The actual expenditures usually exceed the estimates some millions. This is three hundred millions of dollars per year. Now, we have had peace for a hundred years. During that time that means that we had to pay the tax; it takes eleven figures to express this insurance fund. It is in trillions, and all created against foolish fears of attacks which never happen. (Applause.)

Officials under the present administration have recently become prominent in surprising efforts to increase our naval

and military forces, the latest and most startling being Colonel Goethal's estimate of no less than 25,000 soldiers as necessary to guard the Panama Canal, strongly fortified against naval assault as it is. Under present conditions no sensible man would object to adequate protection of our whole country by the army and navy; but, gentlemen, and ladies, too, for they must judge, I submit this is truly madness.

The pending demand is for three battleships this session. But General Wood tells us that the canal once opened is to require more battleships than hitherto, differing in this from President Taft who has assured us that only one battleship per year would be required after the canal was opened, because our fleet could then be transferred either to the Atlantic or Pacific as required, thus doubling its efficiency.

Ex-President Roosevelt has recently held that there is but one way to maintain international peace and that is by keeping our army and navy in such a state of preparation that there will be no temptation on the part of some one else—some one else to go to war with us. "Some one else" is exceedingly indefinite. Our Republic has no one who wishes to go to war with us and has not in our day had any one desirous of doing so, although Mr. Roosevelt himself when President was once strangely frightened. He had proclaimed his policy to be one battleship a year, not to increase the present navy but to maintain its efficiency; but the very next session of Congress he applied for four warships, which the next Congress wisely denied. The dreaded foe has never appeared; his fears were groundless.

When I returned home from my usual trip abroad, his first words were, "You don't approve of my policy?" I said, "Which?" (Laughter and applause.) "You told me about your one-ship policy to maintain efficiency before I left and now you have become frightened at nothing and want four ships. Which of your policies have I deserted? Not the first. (A voice: "Good.") (Applause.) This is all private, gentlemen, and not for publication. (Laughter.)

Now, gentlemen, I quote from authority, the expenses of the army and navy in 1910-11 were \$283,000,000; the entire running expenses for that year were \$654,000,000. The army

and navy received forty-three and one-half per cent, nearly one-half. Adding cost of pensions \$161,000,000—I am sorry to say the pension system is not now in creditable condition—interest on war debt about \$21,000,000, we have a total of \$466,000,000 as against the civil expenses of \$188,000,000. And this represents seventy-one per cent of the total expenditures upon these useless armies and navies. (Applause.) Gentlemen, I assure you it is high time for the American people to look into this, the American people of all parties to look into this question.

No one ventures to name the nation or nations that has the faintest idea of quarreling with us; nor have we any idea of quarreling with any. All we have to do is to show our confidence in the continuance of present happy relations with all and cease expanding either army or navy.

Our military and naval officials fight imaginary foes when they think of possible invasions of enemies. The Republic, having no designs of territorial acquisition abroad nor powerful neighbors at home, has no enemies to fear. It is the reverse with European lands, joined together, each armed against the other as probable invaders. We expect those of our military and navy circles to dwell in their dreams upon possible attacks, devising counter-measures of attack and defense. 'Tis their vocation. What else can they think about? They have nothing else, and they must do what other military authorities do. But to any proposal of increased army or navy we hope our President's response will be, "Pray, gentlemen, tell me first from what enemy you need this further protection. Which nation? Name the power or powers and tell us what object they can have for attacking us; how they can benefit therefrom; what ends they have in view." There are today only two navies greater than our own, those of Great Britain and Germany. We rank third. France has only two dreadnoughts; Italy only two; she will have four at the end of this year. We have thirty-three first-class battleships. Our ships have been more recently constructed than those of Britain. They have ships there fifty to sixty years old—forty anyhow. Ours are practically new and therefore our authorities class

them all as first-class battleships. We have thirty-three and five more under construction at this day.

It is held, ladies and gentlemen, that one of our prime needs today is residences for our ambassadors abroad, the supply of millionaires willing to serve being limited. Why not decide not to build any more dreadnoughts until the five now under construction are completed? Let us have no more until we get the ships we have contracted for. Listen to this: One single battleship less, and we have fifteen million dollars, sufficient to pay for sixty embassies throughout the world costing each \$250,000. I believe it to be the duty of the President of the United States under present conditions to veto any bill that provides another dreadnought until these five at least are completed.

Possible enemies? There are only two, and if you will think for a moment you will see they would not fight us. Britain? Does any sensible man, naval and military officers excepted (laughter), fear war between the two parts of our English-speaking people? Think that question over. Isn't this unthinkable? We as English-speaking men have outgrown the duel, so have we outgrown fratricidal war. We are never again to assail each other, that day has passed. Has there ever been danger of war between Germany and ourselves, members of the same Teutonic race? Never has it ever been imagined. America, Britain and Germany in China marched their united forces under a German general to Peking, and so will these three powers unite again when danger threatens. We are all of the same Teutonic blood, and united would insure the peace of the world. The fourth naval power is our ally of the Revolution, our sister republic of France. Could even an American admiral or general succeed in believing that war was possible between the two republics? No, this would be found beyond the wildest flights of even his busy vivid imagination. What foe, therefore, can we fear? The last census shows that we have no less than twenty-two millions of men subject to militia duty. Imagine an invading force appearing from abroad to attack this force we hold in reserve behind our regular army. Probably months would be needed before the expedition could be ready to sail from abroad with

its hundreds of steamers needed for the troops, with supplies, artillery and ammunition. The President, as commander-in-chief, would call out half a million or a million or two millions of the militia and so prepare for action. We could confidently await results.

A VOICE:

What about Japan?

MR. CARNEGIE:

Japan has only four dreadnoughts, and she has only fifteen cruisers which they call first-class battleships, but are simply cruisers, against our thirty-three battleships and five more coming. Is the gentleman answered? (Applause.)

A VOICE:

Just now we are in mortal terror from that little nation over there.

MR. CARNEGIE:

You speak for yourself. Let every gentleman in this hall that is not afraid of Japan stand up. (Audience rises.) All those who are afraid of poor, little, almost bankrupt Japan stand up. (Nobody rises, continued applause.) Military man, stand up like a man for your convictions, stand up. Gentlemen, that is what the Japan army would do; they would not be counted in a controversy with us. Why don't the gentleman stand up?

A VOICE:

Mr. Carnegie, I think that this scare that our jingoes are trying to work up against Japan is the rankest humbug and bunko. That is what I think about it. I think it is a shame and a crime to try to make an excuse of this sort to build more dreadnoughts. (Applause.) I am heartily with you on this proposition, Mr. Carnegie, not against you.

MR. CARNEGIE:

Now, gentlemen, let us be merciful to the fallen; we pardon your indiscretion. (Laughter.) Anybody else like to ask me a question? (Laughter and applause.)

Gentlemen, in case of an invasion—not from Japan, I think that is out of the question; the gentleman does not know

Japan as I do. I have been there and I have good friends in Japan and I know that they are warmly disposed toward America. They do not want any quarrel with us any more than we want with them. (Applause.) Now, my only fear would be in case of an enemy wishing to invade us that they might refuse our pressing invitation to march inland, we giving peaceful guidance until they decided to stop. Entrance would be unimpeded, but how about their exit? (Laughter and applause.) Surrounded as they would be by hundreds of thousands of armed men who could shoot—there is an advantage we have—we have more private guns and shooters in this country than, I believe, in all the countries of the world combined. Our boys know how to shoot. (Applause.) And thousands of armed men could shoot and would shoot from every point of the compass. Meanwhile our non-export of cotton—to say nothing of our manufactured articles, a recent wonder, at present averaging no less than a million and a half dollars a day. When I was in the steel business we were not exporting manufactures at all, but we are today exporting a million and a half a day. That is the factor of peace. No worry there.

Gentlemen, we need not pursue the subject. (There is not an armed nation, or combination of nations, so foolish as to dream of armed invasion.) Their ships might try to do some mischief while many miles away, upon our coast, but no power on earth could or would attempt to land or march inland. (If any did, the number left to answer roll call upon return would be very small. (Applause.) British authorities consider it would be possible for an enemy to land as many as one hundred and seventy thousand men upon their island in three weeks and they believe they have provided a force sufficient to deal with this number. (Why, we could cope with ten times that number of invaders. If we could only induce their troops to accept our invitation to march far enough inland and partake of our hospitality until they were rested, and give us notice when they were to begin operations, we would probably conquer without firing a shot. Thousands of them might decide to stay in the Great West and work until they could buy a farm.) But I should like to go, as the invaders come to this

country, and reveal to them a triumphant democracy, show them a land where every man's privilege is every citizen's right. (Applause.) I want to apply for that commission if an invasion happens.

Now, really, men who would refuse today to walk abroad without lightning rods down their backs with a ground connection because men have been struck by lightning would be the counterparts of those who fear invasion of this republic, the first risk, however, being much greater than the second.

Insurance companies would make huge profits by selling even at a dollar a head life policies against invasion; all would be clear gain, less cost of printing. Falstaff's foes, both in "Buckram" and in "Kendall Green," were scarcely less imaginary than the fears which apparently surround and appall most of our present professionals, able men as these are in their respective fields. I have the pleasure of knowing them but they are professionals. Not one of the three additional warships demanded this year, if built, will in all probability ever fire a shot against a foe, but will rust into uselessness, forty-five millions of dollars uselessly squandered upon imaginary foes. What a waste of money which could be put to useful ends in improving for the masses the conditions of life! Ladies and gentlemen, there is to be an end to this folly some of these days. A man's profession is his hobby; therefore, if generals are to decide how many soldiers we are to maintain, and a board of admirals how many fifteen-million-dollar battle-ships we are to build to rust away, farewell to common sense, for there are no extremes to which men's hobbies may not lead them.

True, few, if any, of our officers of today have ever seen war, and, thank God! fewer still are ever to see it; but the professional hobby takes root early and grows apace. Let me remind you of what the Marquis of Salisbury said, the great and successful statesman. Here was his advice to his ministers: "Never be guided by military or naval officials. There is nothing they will not propose. I would not be astonished if some day they came here and asked us to fortify against Mars." The gentlemen who tremble at possible inva-

sion of our invincible republic are even madder than Salisbury thought the military and naval officials were. I believe our President will prove to be a man of sound judgment (applause); that his first care will be to guard our country from present obvious dangers, consigning imaginary dangers to the future to which they belong, that future in which so many of our imaginary troubles vanish.

A story told me in my youth has been and is still fruitful. To one condoling with an old man upon his numerous misfortunes, the reply came: "True, I have had many grievous ills to bear, and the strange thing is that nine-tenths of the worst of them never happened." So with our Republic. (She bears a charmed life and all works for her good.) Would that her officials of today, in cabinet, in army and navy, had proper confidence in her future and more faith in her star. (She has not an enemy in the world, nor need she have.) The rulers have no cause of complaint against her. The masses of the people in all civilized lands see in her the standard to which they fondly hope to attain, and they love and reverence her. Hence an army and navy, maintained at present standard, are ample and more than ample. Our Republic has been from its birth the world's most firm advocate of international peace—from the time of our forefathers. There were Washington, Hamilton, Jefferson, Lincoln, and others. Washington's first wish was that war should be abolished from the face of the earth. Grant declared he never wished to see a regiment of soldiers again.

The Senate, on February 14, 1890, passed a resolution requesting the President "to invite, from time to time, as fit occasions may arise, negotiations with any government with which the United States has or may have diplomatic relations, to the end that the differences or disputes arising between the two governments which can not be adjusted by diplomatic agency may be referred to arbitration, and be peaceably adjusted by such means."

Hence treaties were drafted with Britain which the Senate recently failed to ratify. Here we find the initial movement which resulted in the first conference at The Hague—the resolution I have just read. Not less than eighty treaties of obliga-

tory arbitration have since been made. Our nation has been party to twenty-three of these. I believe in the legal peace idea—the formation of an international peace, never for aggression, but always for protection if needed for the peace of the civilized world. This requires only an agreement of a few leading nations. Recently six of these, Portugal, France, Germany, Russia, Japan and America combined their forces in China under the command of one general for a specific purpose which was successfully accomplished. Of the naval nations, eight agreed in London two years ago to exempt private property at sea from capture, as property on land is—the American doctrine for nearly a hundred years. And it now awaits action by the House of Lords; our Senate has unanimously ratified it. Don't blame the Senate too much. I consider the United States Senate the ablest legislative body in the world. (Applause.)

Since the nations are now bound the world round members of one body in telegraphic communication, and their commerce reaches millions of dollars, it is unreasonable that any one nation should longer be permitted to disturb the general peace in which all nations are more or less interested. With three or four of the leading nations combined, constituting as they would an overwhelming force, unbroken peace would almost certainly be assured, for to break it would be folly. If it were broken, however, it would be well before resorting to force for the peace-preserving nations to first proclaim non-intercourse with the disturber, no exchange of products, no military or naval supplies, and above all, no mails. No mails? Can you imagine what a nation becomes cut off from communication? This would serve as a solemn warning and probably prevent war.

We still hear echoes of the past; that war having existed from the earliest times has been and must remain an ineradicable element of humanity. When war ceases, it is said, then farewell to the race of heroes in the land. And many great qualities would exist no more. The reverse is proven true. Peace under industrialism has produced and is producing and will continue to produce the truly heroic, the heroism which

kills not but suffers and dies in the attempt to save their fellow men. Gentlemen, not a day passes unmarked by men and women who voluntarily imperil their lives, not to kill, but to save and serve their fellow men, and that without hope of promotion or reward. (Applause.) Compare the soldier of today who kills his fellows as ordered with the soldier of peace; one the hero of barbarism who kills, the other the hero of civilization who serves and saves. (Applause.)

It is only as man becomes civilized he becomes truly heroic. According to the reports of heroic nations of which I hear, there are eight of them in Europe; and the strongest approver of all is the Emperor of Germany himself. (Applause.) Recently world peace was upon the eve of victory. A treaty of peace was signed as you know by Britain and France and ourselves which would have prevented war between civilized nations, because Germany would have joined as its Ambassador intimated. And this armistice would have given any powers threatening war a gentle intimation that they were expected to follow the example of those who had abolished war, those who threatened peace would not be overlooked.

The historic failure to secure the support of the Senate need not be dwelt upon. Suffice it to say the fault was not altogether with the Senate. Sometimes a blunder is said to be worse than a crime, and some one blundered. Looking backward the error is clearly seen and we venture to predict that the present administration will deal successfully with this vital question. (Applause.)

If so, this influence will be world-wide and the President will take rank above all men as the greatest world benefactor who has ever lived, because he will have laid the ax to the root of the tree and banished man-killing by man from the civilized world. (Applause.) For all that was done by any or all reformers pales into utter insignificance compared with the banishment of this appalling crime. The President has stood and still stands for international peace under the reign of law. Our Secretary of State gives no doubtful utterance upon this commanding issue. He has been around the world and realizes that the brotherhood of man is no dream

and has written his idea in his great argument, "Let our anxious prayer be that this greatest of all boons to man may come from our beloved Republic, which was the first to invite the nations to dethrone war and establish world peace." (Applause.)

Man-killing as a means of settling disputes is a crying sin, a curse and disgrace of our times and civilization. So long as we tolerate man-killing as a profession we are barbaric. Yes, savage. (Applause.) Future ages are to regard this heinous crime as we today regard those of past times, poisoned wells, sacked cities and burned villages as offerings to the gods which the ancient historians described. And yet it was the only profession which a gentleman could accept. Today we could not induce men to engage in such savagery or induce men to engage in such a profession which was only considered fit for a gentleman. This diabolical man killing man is truly, as has been said by a man that knew all about war, General Sherman, "The foulest fiend ever vomited from the mouth of hell." General Sherman declared war to be hell. Friends of peace, Prime Minister Asquith has just said, "War is the greatest scourge remaining that still threatens the community and progress of man." Friends of peace, be of good cheer as I am. I have not a particle of doubt of success. This savage crime of man-killing is soon to become of the past. A new era has come proclaiming the dawn of the day "when the drum beats no longer and the battle flags are furled in the parliament of man, the federation of the world." Burns' prophesy comes apace, "When man to man the world over shall brothers be." All is well, friends, all is well, since all grows better. In this, our holy crusade, there can be no such word as failure. (Prolonged applause.)

SECRETARY TRUEBLOOD:

I hope I am voicing the sentiment of this audience when I say this was a most instructive and interesting address just given us by Mr. Carnegie, and I ask you to rise from your seats for the purpose of expressing your appreciation of his talk.

[Audience arises with continued applause.]

President's Address

HON. RICHARD BARTHOLDT.

This is a Congress of representative Americans convened for the avowed purpose of promoting the cause of international peace. It is the fourth of its kind, the first having been held at New York in 1907, the second at Chicago in 1909, the third at Baltimore in 1911. As a St. Louisan I am proud of the honor conferred upon this city by its selection as the meeting place of such a distinguished gathering for so noble a cause, and I am happy to say, too, that its citizenship is no stranger to the ideals for which you strive, for it was here in 1904 that the Interparliamentary Union passed its historic resolution known in the chancellories of the world as the "Resolution of St. Louis," which called upon the President of the United States to convene a second Hague Conference and declared at the same time in favor of universal arbitration treaties and an international parliament. Hence we are actually meeting on ground made historical by an incident which in the last decade was destined to supply the real and vital issues of the peace movement.

It has been said that the Congress meets "under war clouds." True enough, but if so, the greater the necessity, it seems to me, for this meeting and the more urgent the need of our educational propaganda. Certain people delight in reminding us with every new war of the futility of our efforts, but who dares say we are in the wrong or that our efforts will be futile in the end? As a matter of fact, the cause of peace has sufficiently advanced that even today every shot fired, every life lost, every drop of blood shed is recognized as a fervent appeal to the human conscience to heed those who urge a more humane method of settling differences between nations. In the agony, the loss, the moral damage, the hell of war, the peace movement finds, not its condemnation, but its complete justification. While the constantly imminent possibility of war and the frequent instances of actual hostilities are evidences of the disregard of its lessons, the facts, we beg to remind our Jingo friends, are also proof positive that armaments are no reliable guarantee of

peace. The situation, therefore, is that every recurring war, while vindicating the position of the peace party and the necessity of its existence, destroys simultaneously the stock argument of the war party, namely, the well-known assertion that armaments are unfailing safeguards against possible war. "Meeting under war clouds," then, proves nothing against us pacifists except that our advice has not yet been sufficiently heeded, but, on the other hand, no one can escape the conclusion that the continued existence of war clouds in an era of armaments is a complete refutation of the arguments of those who are constantly promising us cloudless skies as the result of big armies and big navies. Once convinced of this logic the world is bound to turn, eventually, from their remedies to ours.

This is no ordinary occasion. Beyond doubt it is one of the most notable meetings ever assembled on American soil. Gathered here are men from bench and pulpit, from farm and factory, from the rostrum, the counting room and the legislative hall, and, reinforced by American mothers and wives, these representatives of commerce, labor, education, philanthropy, religion and reform lay aside whatever other differences may separate them and enter into hearty concurrence in favor of the world's pacification. Irrespective of any action to be taken here this Congress in itself is a most significant demonstration, for it may fairly be said that through it the voice and conscience of America speak out in solemn protest against the continued shedding of human blood, at the same time admonishing governments that a system must soon be devised to safeguard peace by international agreement rather than instruments of war, by the rule of law rather than by battleships. We may differ as to method, but we are all agreed that, as Abraham Lincoln has stopped the selling of men, the time has now come for us to also stop the killing of men, in other words that disputes between governments shall be settled peaceably, the same as disputes between individuals. And there is no longer uncertainty even as to the method. Arbitration treaties between the great nations, a tribunal at The Hague with judicial powers, universally recognized as the world's court of arbitral justice, and a public

sentiment which will insist on the inviolability of treaties is all that is needed, in the judgment of the world's thinkers, to place this and all other nations on a permanent peace footing. And this, my friends, is the goal we strive for. It is in a nutshell the whole program of the modern peace movement, which, if carried out, will admittedly minimize the danger of war and raise our civilization upon a higher level. It will cause an automatic reduction of armaments and a consequent annual saving in the United States alone, of a hundred million dollars or more. It will raise the standard of labor, make investments more secure, stimulate commerce and trade and, by stirring man's moral impulses, will carry him upward to his higher mission. You will all agree that, as compared with the hope of such great achievements, all other progressive measures which politicians are now trying to force upon our attention, fade into utter insignificance.

On occasions like this it is customary for the friends of universal peace to compare notes, to take stock, so to speak, of the progress made and to measure the distance they shall still have to travel toward their coveted goal. What will the answer be? That in the last fifteen years more progress has been made than in the eighteen centuries before. All the known governments of the globe, as many as there are stars in our flag, have at last consented to talk the matter over with you. For the purpose of agreeing on conditions for more permanent peace they have already held two world conferences, and the chancellories of Europe, Asia and America are now burning midnight oil preparing for the third. Great results, too well known to need enumeration here, have come from these councils, greater are yet to come. In the meantime the whole globe is being covered with a network of arbitration treaties, a policy entered into cautiously at first, but proclaimed more boldly by President Taft when he proposed to arbitrate practically all questions of difference between the United States and the rest of the world. Would monarchical Europe, we asked ourselves anxiously, respond with such a far-reaching concession to the invitation of a free government? Yes, for a higher unity and for more enduring peace the three greatest nations were

willing to curtail their own sovereignty to that extent. It was then that the American Senate balked, but don't worry. If the men and women assembled here will do their duty, a more progressive Senate will never again prove a stumbling block to the realization of your great ideal and mine. American public sentiment will not permit our country to be stigmatized as lagging behind and as more backward even than the military powers of the old world, and we are here to say so. But speaking of progress that which is intangible was as pronounced during the last fifteen years as was the visible advance. The mental attitude of governments and peoples is rapidly changing in favor of our great cause, and the press, anxious to truly reflect public opinion, is following suit. More than that. The great powers are more reluctant to resort to hostilities, in fact, are using their good offices to preserve and restore peace by combined effort. This was the case in China, and the Balkan war is a more recent example. That very war was proof of the wonderful advance of the great cause of peace. Up to ten or fifteen years ago the lighting of a match in the Balkans would have been sure to cause an European conflagration, and today? Why, the great powers, averse to disturbance, are jointly enforcing peace conditions by using the rod against the unruly children who are driving the Turk out of Europe. What a change, my countrymen! Bismarck said on one occasion, if Turkey were out of existence she would have to be invented to preserve the European balance of power, and now, in the face even of a complete change of the Balkan map, the great governments sit spellbound, evidently afraid to make a move and too timid to fire a shot. What conclusions can we draw from this spectacle other than that the desire for peace has become stronger than even armies and navies or the temptation to use them?

With the concentration of the world's best thought upon the problem of substituting the rule of law for the rule of force, the vision has become clearer. It is no longer a hope, but a conviction, no longer a dream of theorists, but a vital principle affirmed by practical statesmen. It will not be long before it will appear in the shape of vigorous planks in

the platforms of all the parties, and why? Is it because the politicians have suddenly discovered war to be a sin, a wrong, a barbarous crime? Strange to say, no. For eighteen hundred years Christianity has so taught us, but even Christian nations were not estopped by these considerations from cutting each other's throats. But what has proved stronger than moral lesson is self-interest. Under the weight of armaments the world is staggering toward bankruptcy. The military system saps the life blood of all nations leaving them too enfeebled to undertake the most needed internal improvements and the most necessary social and economic reforms. Business knows it can not prosper except in times of peace. Labor knows it has to bear the burden and foot the bill of war. The farmer knows that war decimates his customers and devastates the fruit of his labor. The old theory that military power is necessary to build up a nation's trade has at last been exploded, for the trade of Norway and Belgium, unsupported by navies, is proportionately three times that of England, while the bonds of these little countries command considerably higher prices than those of the great naval powers. These, my friends, are some of the considerations which prompt a steadily increasing number of thinking men to enlist in the war against war, and will in no distant time be the propelling forces to ring out the old and ring in the new order of things.

It is plain that the world's great rulers, though willing to make concessions to the spirit of the times, will not voluntarily abolish war. Relief from that "greatest scourge of mankind," as Washington called it, must come from a country where the people rule. The millions in other lands, therefore, who are groaning under the intolerable burdens of that lingering war which is politely called armed peace, are looking to this great Republic for deliverance. The American people have proclaimed the liberty of man and demonstrated the possibility of self-government. They have set new standards and taught the world new lessons of freedom under the people's rule. They have broken with the traditions of the Old World in matters of government, will they not also depart from them, for the sake of justice, humanity and

peace, in the matters settling differences between nations? I have an abiding faith that they will. Their own welfare and their unwritten obligations to the world require it. The new administration, following in the footsteps of its illustrious predecessor, has already proclaimed its intention to lead, and if the plans are adopted, it will in all probability signify both the end of war and the dawn of an era when, in the language of Victor Hugo, "the only battlefield will be the market open to commerce and the mind opening to new ideas." And, thank the Lord, America again holds aloft the scepter of leadership in this great cause! (Applause.)

PRESIDENT BARTHOLDT:

I now introduce a gentleman whom you probably all know by reputation. Every great movement has its pioneers and I take pleasure in introducing to you such a pioneer in the person of our beloved General Secretary of the American Peace Society, Dr. Benjamin F. Trueblood.

The Present Demands of the Peace Movement

BENJAMIN F. TRUEBLOOD.

The peace movement in its organized form is now nearing its hundredth anniversary. The century covered by it has been, from the pacifist point of view, one of extraordinary significance, the full force of which it is not easy to state. From three societies, small and little known, in 1815, the movement has grown till now the peace organizations throughout the world number more than six hundred, several of them of national scope, and new ones are coming into existence continually. These organizations, devoted exclusively to the one great end, are closely affiliated in an International Congress which meets annually in leading cities, and in a Permanent Peace Bureau at Berne, whose governing board is composed of thirty-five prominent pacifists from different nations. The literature of the movement—papers, pamphlets, books—of which there was scarcely a pocketful a hundred years ago, has grown until at the present time it would take a good sized library to hold it. A union of

pacifist members of Parliaments has come into existence in the last two decades with more than three thousand members, whose conferences, like the peace congresses, are held under the auspices of the governments in whose domains they meet.

Since the rise of the peace movement in 1815, and in considerable measure in response to the pressure which it has brought to bear, the principle of arbitration has been applied to the adjustment of international controversies until it has become in our day the regular practice of the governments to settle their differences in this way, instead of plunging into war over them. The century record of three hundred and more important cases of settlement by this method constitutes one of the most luminous pages of history. The century began with war the rule, and no exceptions; it ends with arbitration the rule, and war the exception.

Two Governmental Peace Conferences have been held at The Hague participated in by all the important nations of the world. Through these conferences a permanent International Court of Arbitration has been set up and successfully employed for more than a decade in the settlement of controversies—a dozen of them. An agreement among the nations has been reached that The Hague International Peace Conference shall meet periodically hereafter, the beginning of a world parliament. The regular International Court of Justice has in principle been unanimously approved by the governments, and only waits for the discovery of a practical method of selecting the judges to be put into operation. Treaties of arbitration, limited in scope, have been concluded among all the important governments, and serve as a strong bulwark against the outbreak of war.

These great accomplishments, not to go further into detail, are sufficient proof that the peace movement is an eminently practical as well as an absolutely imperative one, and that its founder and early apostles did not go beyond reason and good sense in conceiving that such a system of good-will and law might be established among the nations as would banish the horrid system of war from the earth.

Toward that great end the processes of our civilization are now clearly seen to be moving. The peoples of the different advanced nations—the rank and file of them in large numbers, the working classes, the socialist groups, the business men, the intellectuals in considerable measure, have got it into their heads that war is no longer a necessity in our time, that no excuse remains for it, and that the huge preparations for warfare on land and sea which are consuming the meagre resources of “men the workers” are not only needless but positively criminal.

In view of the remarkable progress which has thus been made toward realizing the great purpose of the world-peace movement and of the extraordinary change which a century has wrought in public opinion in regard to war, in view also of the leading part taken by our country, both privately and governmentally, in the movement, the question naturally arises what phases of the subject should the peace party, especially in the United States, keep to the front, emphasize and push with all energy at the present. Let me sketch in a few brief statements what both opportunity and duty demand of us—the very least that we can do and be loyal to the great principles and policies which we espoused and which we have gathered in this Congress to promote.

1. First of all we must put forth more earnest and constant effort to bring the people, all the people, all kinds of people, over to our side. This is fundamental. The cause is the people's cause. It is they who suffer most from war and on whom the burdens of the current colossal preparations for war press most ruinously. They are fast learning this. They do not so much need convincement; they need gathering and organizing. They are sound at heart for the most part; sounder than some loud-mouthed pacifists who are for peace today and for war tomorrow. They must be given a chance to understand the full meaning of the peace movement to themselves, and to express themselves fully and clearly. When the people are by our sides, and only when they are by our sides, will the peace movement enter victoriously upon its final stage. It will take money to do this work, much more than is now at our disposal, even since the magnifi-

cent Carnegie and Ginn Foundations were established. The price of two or three of the latest battleships would do it. Somebody must give this money; somebody will give it.

2. In the next place we must urge, in season and out of season, that all controversies between nations not susceptible of adjustment by direct negotiation shall be submitted to the Court of Arbitration at The Hague, which the governments of the world have solemnly set up for this very purpose, or to other tribunals which it may be found advisable to create at the moment. We have already heard too much about "national honor" and "vital interests" and hair-splitting distinctions between justiceable and non-justiceable disputes. Are we not trying to conceal a secret hankering after "war and pillage" every time we use one of these vague and indefinable terms? There are no unarbitrable controversies in our day between nations whose independence is mutually recognized.

A great step in the direction of the establishment of a system of unrestricted arbitration of disputes just failed of being taken last summer when the Senate, by only a single majority vote, so amended the treaties of Great Britain and France that the heart was taken out of them. The country was with President Taft in favor of the treaties, as the Senators' desks piled high—some of them vexatiously high—day after day with letters and telegrams bore unmistakable witness. Every effort must be made to have similar treaties of unlimited scope, somewhat simpler in form possibly, concluded as speedily as practical not only with Great Britain and France, but also with Germany and all other powers which may be willing to join with us. Limited treaties of arbitration, of which our country has had twenty-four for the last five years, which are being renewed this spring as they expire, are good as far as they go. But they do not meet the demands of the present. We have moved up a good many paces since these treaties were signed in the spring of 1908. When the new administration takes up this matter, as it is expected to do at an early date, every possible influence must be brought to bear to make it uncomfortable for any Senator to oppose the new treaties.

3. Not the least of our forces should be directed this year and next to bringing every influence to bear upon all the powers to make the next Hague Conference, to be held two years hence, as potent as possible in carrying forward the judicial and political organization of the world for perpetual peace. The general treaty of obligatory arbitration to be signed by all the nations jointly, which failed of adoption in 1907 for lack of unanimity though it carried the support through their representatives at The Hague of nearly the whole population and territory of the globe, must not be allowed to fail again. We may reasonably expect also that if the friends of peace bestir themselves and make their power felt, the third Hague Conference will devise a method of selecting judges for the International High Court of Justice which was voted in principle in 1907, and thus complete this supremely important step in the progress of world order and peace.

Not to specify further the important things of secondary order with which the coming Hague Conference should be asked to deal effectively, let me devote the remainder of my time to the most urgent of all the international peace problems of our day, that of an arrest of the current rivalry in armaments.

4. The question of limitation and reduction of armaments and the attending budgets of expense, like the famous ghost of Banquo, will not down. It is more thought about, talked about and written about, pro and con, than any other international question. The Czar of Russia in 1898 placed the subject foremost in his Rescript urging the necessity of an international conference. The First Hague Conference adopted a resolution urging upon the governments the study of the subject with a view to finding relief for the peoples from the excessive burdens laid upon them by the great armaments. The Second Hague Conference unanimously voted again the recommendation with greater emphasis than was given in 1899. Not long ago the Prime Minister of England declared the present rivalry in armaments, at such enormous cost, to be satire on civilization. The heads of a number of governments, and especially the Chancellors of various

Exchequers who annually rack their brains to find new sources of revenue, have declared their intense dissatisfaction with the situation and their readiness to limit and reduce armaments if other powers will do the same. But so far nothing has been done. No effort has been made to carry out the recommendations of the Hague Conference. No government has had the sense or the courage even to propose seriously the study of the question by all the governments. But suspicion and fear, charge and countercharge of evil designs, imaginings of pending invasion by sea and air have continued to prevail, and the armaments and war budgets to pile up to mountainous proportions. Just now Germany has had a fresh attack of shivers over the Balkan military successes and the increased prominence into which the Slavs have thus been brought, and has decided to increase her great army from over 600,000 to above 800,000 men and to add several new dreadnoughts to her navy. France sniffs the east wind and votes to increase her army and navy in the same proportion. Great Britain groans and votes to lay down five new dreadnoughts. Russia growls and orders the creation of three new army corps, and so on. All sense of economy and of the crushing burdens laid on the taxpayers is thrown to the winds and a new stage of the race to the abyss of destruction has commenced. Has Europe gone stark mad?

Here then is the immediate, unescapable task of our peace organizations. If we have any faith, any courage, we will undertake the attack at once. The barrier of the big and ever growing armaments lies directly across our path. Little more can be done until it is broken down. It is in the way of completion of nearly every constructive measure that we have in hand. The powers who have the biggest armaments and depend upon them for safety and honor will not go the whole length in the creation of pacific institutions through which force is relegated to the background. It was the biggest army and the biggest navy of the world that defeated two of the most prominent propositions at the Second Hague Conference.

In spite, however, of the general darkness and hopelessness of the situation a ray of light has sprung up in our own

Capital. It is universally conceded and no longer needs to be argued that our country is most favorably situated to take the lead in the solution of this difficult problem. The solution has indeed already begun. Congress for two successive years has refused, the second time in spite of the enormous pressure brought to bear upon it by the new Navy League, to make appropriations for more than one new battleship annually; in other words has arrested, temporarily at least, the growth of the navy, for the new ship annually just makes up for an old one going out of commission. This position taken by the national legislature, in response I am sure to the wish of the people, should have the instant and unequivocal support of all pacifists regardless of party affiliations. Besides this our government must be led to feel that the United States from its character and geographical situation is under peculiar obligation to take up immediately with the other powers the question of a general agreement for both the limitation and the reduction of armaments. The time is over-ripe for our civilization, if it does not wish to perish in such a cataclysm as the world never saw, to unload this monstrous burden which cripples and disgraces it. And the Third Hague Conference must not be allowed to pass without the accomplishment of what everybody longs to see done.

PRESIDENT BARTHOLDT:

The chairman has been requested to announce the committee which has been generally agreed upon as a Committee on Resolutions. To this committee will be referred all resolutions that may be offered at this time or later. The committee consists of Dr. Benjamin F. Trueblood, Dr. James L. Tryon, President Charles F. Thwing, President S. C. Mitchell, Mr. Edwin L. Prince, Mr. Charles E. Beals, Mr. James E. Smith, Mr. Robert S. Brookings, Mrs. Philip N. Moore, Mr. Edwin D. Mead and Prof. Roland G. Usher. If any of the delegates in the audience have any suggestions to make as to any particular addition to the membership of this committee the chair is willing to entertain his judgment.

A DELEGATE:

I would like to suggest as an addition to this resolutions committee the president of the Missouri Congress of Mothers, Mrs. James G. Nugent.

PRESIDENT BARTHOLDT:

It has been suggested that Mrs. James G. Nugent, President of the Missouri Congress of Mothers, be added to this committee. All in favor of this motion will say, "Aye."

DELEGATES:

Aye.

PRESIDENT BARTHOLDT:

Countermined, "No." (No response.) Unanimously carried.

The Chair wishes to make a further suggestion; namely, that this afternoon at 2:00 o'clock a session will be held here in this same hall which, no doubt, will prove most interesting. It is to be "A Symposium on Disarmament" in which all those present may participate if they desire, and I hope all will endeavor to be present. This meeting now stands adjourned until 2:00 o'clock.

CONFERENCE ON ORGANIZATION

THE PROMOTION OF INTERNATIONAL PEACE

Thursday Afternoon, May 1, at 2 o'clock

ODEON RECITAL HALL

**MR. ARTHUR DEERIN CALL, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF THE
AMERICAN PEACE SOCIETY, Presiding**

DIRECTOR CALL:

As you gentlemen know, this is simply a conference on organization and propaganda. Mr. Beals, who is the head of the Department of the Central-West, with headquarters in Chicago, is under engagement to speak on another program. So I am going to withdraw from the first position and ask Mr. Beals to give us the message which is in his mind. Mr. Beals, of Chicago.

Some Experiences in Enlisting Clubs and Other Organizations in Peace Work

CHARLES E. BEALS.

Fellow "Warriors:" This mighty Captain of ours told me in a letter over his own signature to come Saturday afternoon, and I was counting on two whole days to write out what I intended to say. When I looked at the program this morning and saw my name for this afternoon I jotted down a few things.

Enlisting clubs and other organizations in the cause of peace! First I will speak of the clubs. We tried to work through them. We have offered them speakers and tried to get them to become valued members of the local society, and many of them have. Many of the best clubs in the city are affiliated with us and pay in dues each year. When the Bar-oness came last fall we wrote several influential clubs, and many of them, something like twenty-seven, coöperated.

Secondly, churches! We have not done much with them. A year ago we printed a little pamphlet and sent it to the ministers, suggesting that they have a Peace Sunday. A great many of them did. We had a group meeting of two hundred churches on the West Side, and scores of individual pastors preached.

Each Christmas I send out a special circular, appealing to the clergy, but we get practically no help from them. If we can educate them to a Peace Sunday, that is pretty good work for Chicago. These out-of-town churches are not facing the downtown problem as they are with us. I don't suppose there is such a discouraged pulpit in the world as there is in Chicago, for economic reasons.

With the schools, we have not done much. Mrs. Young is with us, but in her report in which she inserted a recommendation for the observance of a day in the schools, it was blue-penciled and Mrs. Young did not press the matter, but when the time comes we shall get it. Dr. Jones and Mr. Goddard are working for us, and we shall get this in time. Individual schools are doing work. Mrs. Hilbrook is here. Others are interested, but it takes time.

Now, the papers! Of course, like other organizations, we are feeding out "dope." If anything important comes up I send it out. Some of the papers have been very good. The editorials of the Record-Herald have been just as good as the Advocate of Peace. Of course, we try to get the press. I wish you would read what Dr. Jenkin Lloyd Jones has to say. Every week he hammers away for the peace cause. This is a reinforcement for the peace cause of the country.

The Association of Commerce has been tremendously good to us. They have been just as a big brother. When we were organizing the Chicago Congress they got us before the Ways and Means Committee and gave a thousand dollars right out of the Association treasury and canvassed the members and raised fifteen hundred dollars more; and they gave a banquet at the end of the Congress which cost them a thousand dollars more. To this day that was, and is, the

biggest thing Chicago ever pulled off in the way of a banquet. They have always been good to us.

We try to keep out of sight as a peace society. We don't want to frighten people away. I think the best work of the Chicago society has been by keeping out of sight, and I think in some cases a mistake is made in not getting other people to do certain things, for in the doing they will become interested. We have a big program blocked out, and we shall complete it, but we shall keep out of sight. I have said I would ten times rather get a thing done by somebody else than to have our society do it.

Of course, where there are possibilities all of us are right there to do these things. I have mentioned these as typical of the lines along which we are working.

Now, my friends, I hope you will not feel that I am like the old doctor who went to a meeting once and made a talk and had to leave immediately. Next day he met a man and said: "That was a remarkable meeting you had yesterday. The exercises were excellent and high grade in character." He was there only while he was making the speech. (Laughter.) I have stayed longer than I should and I beg your pardon for running over the time.

Facts Relating to the Field

ARTHUR DEERIN CALL.

In this paper it is assumed that the workers for international peace are interested in as many facts relating to the field as it is possible to learn. It is assumed that only as we know the facts can we work intelligently toward the accomplishment of our aims, and I therefore submit the following data relating primarily to the work of the American Peace Society. I began my work on September 3, 1912, and the data which I submit is limited data, naturally. The following table shows the departments already organized by the American Peace Society, the headquarters of each department, the states canvassed by each, the constituency included, and the department directors.

Departments	Headquarters	States	Constituency	Directors
1. Central West.	Chicago	{ Illinois Iowa Indiana Ohio Michigan Wisconsin }	20,500,000	C. E. Beals.
2. New England.	Boston	New England States.	6,500,000	J. L. Tryon.
3. New York	New York City.	{ New York New Jersey }	11,500,000	S. T. Dutton.
4. Pacific Coast..	Los Angeles..	{ Washington.. Oregon California }	4,500,000	Robt. C. Root.
5. South Atlantic States	Atlanta, Ga..	{ Virginia Florida N. Carolina S. Carolina Georgia }	9,280,000	J. J. Hall.

The following are the "Constituent Branches" of the American Peace Society, given in alphabetical order, together with the location and number of paid-up members of each:

SOCIETY.	No. of members.
1. Buffalo Peace Society, Buffalo, N. Y.	115
2. California Peace Society (Northern), Berkeley, Cal.	75
3. California Peace Society (Southern), Los Angeles, Cal.	310
4. Chicago Peace Society, Chicago, Ill.	462
5. Cleveland Peace Society, Cleveland, Ohio.	44
6. Connecticut Peace Society, Hartford, Conn.	245
7. Cincinnati, The Arbitration and Peace Society of Cincinnati, Ohio	100
8. Georgia Peace Society, Atlanta, Ga.	38
9. German-American Peace Society, New York City.	91
10. Italian-American Peace Society, New York City.	42
11. Maine Peace Society, Portland, Me.	91
12. Maryland Peace Society, Baltimore, Md.	218
13. Massachusetts Peace Society, Boston, Mass.	894
14. Missouri Peace Society, St. Louis, Mo.	107
15. Nebraska Peace Society, Lincoln, Neb.	216
16. New Hampshire Peace Society, Concord, N. H.	116
17. New York Peace Society, New York City.	800
18. North Carolina Peace Society, Raleigh, N. C.	45
19. Oregon Peace Society, Portland, Ore.	Not reported

	SOCIETY.	No. of members.
20.	Pennsylvania Arbitration and Peace Society, Philadelphia, Pa.	212
21.	Rhode Island Peace Society, Providence, R. I.	Not reported
22.	Utah Peace Society, Salt Lake City, Utah.	22
23.	Vermont Peace Society, Montpelier, Vt.	Not reported
24.	Washington Peace Society, Seattle, Wash.	Not reported
25.	Washington (D. C.) Peace Society.	103
26.	Wisconsin Peace Society, Madison, Wis.	113
27.	Youngstown Peace Society, Youngstown, Ohio.	73
	Branch Society membership (reported January 1, 1913) ...	4,532
	Other paid-up members	1,135
	Total paid-up members	5,667

Some constituent branches have organized section societies as follows:

1. California State Normal, San Jose. Section of California Peace Society (Northern).
2. Columbia Peace Society, Columbia, Mo. Section of Missouri Peace Society. Forty-two members.
3. Derry Peace Society, Derry N. H. Section of New Hampshire Peace Society.
4. Hudson and Mohawk Rivers' Peace Society, Albany, N. Y. Section of the New York Peace Society.
5. Redlands Peace Society, Redlands, Cal. Section of California Peace Society (Southern).

The American Peace Society has two auxiliary branches. They are:

1. The Intercollegiate Peace Association, Yellow Springs, Ohio. Ninety colleges; sixteen States.
2. The Kansas State Peace Society, Wichita, Kan.

Societies Otherwise Associated or Coöperating with the American Peace Society are:

1. The American Society for the Judicial Settlement of International Disputes elects a director of our Society.
2. The American School Peace League, with thirty-three State Branch Societies, elects a director of our Society.
3. The Carnegie Endowment for International Peace gives a subvention to our Society.
4. The World Peace Foundation elects a director of our Society.
5. The Lake Mohonk Conference on International Arbitration co-operates in various ways.

The following societies have been organized since January, 1912, as constituent branches of the American Peace Society:

1912.	
1. New York Peace Society	January.
2. New York German-American Peace Society	"
3. Pennsylvania Arbitration and Peace Society	"
4. Main Peace Society	February.
5. Nebraska Peace Society	"
6. New Hampshire Peace Society	"
7. Rhode Island Peace Society	May.
8. Vermont Peace Society	"
9. Wisconsin Peace Society	October.
10. Missouri Peace Society	"
11. Youngstown Peace Society	December.
1913.	
12. North Carolina Peace Society	March.

The American Peace Society has granted financial aid to the following:

1. California Peace Society	The total amount appropriated to these societies for the year 1912 was \$14,700.
2. Connecticut Peace Society	
3. Washington (D. C.) Peace Society	
4. Chicago Peace Society	
5. Maryland Peace Society	
6. Massachusetts Peace Society	
7. Nebraska Peace Society	
8. New Hampshire Peace Society	
9. New York Peace Society	
10. New York German-American Peace Society	
11. Buffalo Peace Society	
12. Cleveland Peace Society	
13. Pennsylvania Arbitration and Peace Society	
14. Utah Peace Society	
15. The Intercollegiate Peace Association	

Since beginning his work, the Executive Director has delivered addresses as follows: The Maryland Agricultural College; Eastern High School, Washington, D. C.; Washington Branch of the American School Peace League; Amherst Agricultural College, Amherst, Mass.; Delta Kappa Epsilon Alumni, Washington, D. C.; University of Missouri; Federal School Men's Club, Washington, D. C.; Delaware Peace

Society, Wilmington, Del.; Methodist Episcopal Church, Catonsville, Md.; Friends' School, Washington, D. C.; A. and M. College, Raleigh, N. C.; four other addresses in Raleigh, N. C.

A provisional list of departments needing yet to be organized is here presented as a basis for future study and development:

Departments	Headquarters	States	Constituency	Directors
1. Central Atlantic	Philadelphia.	{ Pennsylvania . Maryland . . . Delaware . . . West Virginia . }	10,380,000	
2. Department of North	Lincoln, Neb.	{ Minnesota . . . Nebraska . . . Kansas Missouri }	8,250,000	
3. Department of the South-east	Nashville, Tenn.	{ Kentucky . . . Mississippi . . Alabama Tennessee . . . }	8,408,000	
4. Department of the South .	Dallas, Tex. . .	{ Arkansas . . . Texas Louisiana . . . Oklahoma . . . }	8,700,000	
5. Department of the South-west	Salt Lake City	{ Nevada Utah Colorado Arizona New Mexico . . }	1,700,000	
6. Department of the North-west	Pierre, S. D., or Helena, Mont	{ Idaho Wyoming . . . N. Dakota . . . S. Dakota . . . Montana }	2,000,000	
7. Hawaii	Honolulu	Hawaiian Islands	190,000	
8. Philippines . . .	Manila	The Archipelago.	8,000,000	

The following facts on Aims, Organization, Methods and Results are gathered from as thorough a study of twenty-one

branches of coöperating societies as possible under the circumstances. The societies studied are as follows:

- | | |
|--------------------------------------|--|
| 1. California | 12. Missouri |
| 2. Chicago | 13. Nebraska |
| 3. Cincinnati | 14. New Hampshire |
| 4. Derry | 15. New York |
| 5. Intercollegiate Peace Association | 16. Texas |
| 6. New York Italian | 17. Utah |
| 7. Kansas | 18. Wisconsin |
| 8. Massachusetts | 19. American School Peace League |
| 9. Lake Mohonk Conference | 20. Connecticut |
| 10. Maine. | 21. Pennsylvania Arbitration and Peace Society |
| 11. Maryland | |

The aims of the societies are in substantial accord. They may be stated as follows:

1. To promote the active coöperation of all agencies working for international fraternity, and that on the largest possible scale.

2. To extend the education of the people in the causes, effects, and prevention of war.

3. To facilitate the establishment of a world order on the basis of justice, of international law, of the known principles of economy, and of the established lessons of history.

4. To carry on this work as vigorously, effectively, and scientifically as possible.

In addition to the above, the California Peace Societies aim especially "to counteract the influence of the Japanese war bogey of the Pacific coast." The New York Peace Society calls attention to the fact that it welcomes to its membership all men and women who are willing to work toward its end, "however widely they may differ as to measures and methods," and adds: "This society does not oppose such armament as may be necessary for adequate national protection." The Pennsylvania Society emphasizes also the "limitations of armament by agreement."

The following facts relate to the officials, the meetings, and the finances of the societies reporting January 1, 1913:

Three of the societies have "honorary presidents;" with the exception of the Mohonk Conference, they all have "presidents." The number of "vice-presidents" varies from one to thirty-one. One society reports twenty-seven "honorary vice-presidents" another combines its twenty-four "vice-presidents" with sixty other persons into an "Advisory Council." One has a "Council" of sixty-five. All of the societies have "secretaries," some of whom serve also as "treasurer." A number of the societies report a "Board of Directors," varying in size from eight to thirty. One society has an "Advisory Board" of fifty; another of forty-five. One society has a "General Committee" of five; one has a "Finance Committee" of five, another of nine; one has an "Advisory Council" of twenty-two. One society reports an "Educational Committee" of eight, and a committee on "Organization and Membership" of five. A majority of the societies have "Executive Committees," ranging in number from three to fifteen. One society reports thirteen "Standing Committees," another eight. Only nine of the societies have employed officers; of these nine, one employs a "Secretary-Treasurer" and an "Office Secretary;" two a "Secretary" and an "Office Secretary;" another employs a "Secretary," with two or more "Stenographers;" one employs a "Secretary," an "Assistant Secretary," with one or more "Stenographers;" two employ an "Assistant Secretary" only; one employs an "Executive Secretary," with three "Assistants." One other society employs "irregular service." Nine of the societies have telephones, one of them reporting two.

Fifteen of the societies meet regularly—one quarterly, one in May and October, three in January, two in February, two in October, one at the Annual Convention of the National Education Association, the rest in the month of May. Three of the societies meet irregularly. One reports regular meetings of its "Committee on History" and its "Committee on Course in Citizenship." Five of the societies report regular

meetings of their Advisory Council, Board of Directors, or Executive Committees.

The annual membership fee fixed by the societies is, with one exception, one dollar. One society sets its annual membership at two dollars. The income of the societies from their membership is fifty cents for every annual member. Some societies have a few two-dollar "contributing members," five-dollar "sustaining members," and twenty-five dollar "life members." This income from members varies from \$11 to \$3,758 annually. One society, with no membership, receives in donations from other societies \$1,200, and from private donations \$1,800. Eight of the societies, with an income from membership, report donations from other societies varying from \$100 to \$6,000. One society, with no income from membership or from other societies, receives from private donations \$1,800. One society reports "donations" of \$11,725. Nine other societies report incomes from private donations varying from \$5.00 to \$5,330.50. The total income of the societies reporting is as follows:

From membership, \$9,212.60; from donations, \$16,810.75; from private donations, \$31,268.09. Total income of the societies reporting, \$57,325.00. One society received from collections \$44.26, and from a church appropriation \$200.

The largest total annual income for any society was \$13,496.60. The next highest annual income was \$11,829.19; the next \$7,500; the next, \$6,563.06; the next, \$5,052.88; the next, \$4,818.76; the next, \$3,000; the next, \$2,025; the next, \$1,243.01; the next, \$602.09; the next, \$404.50; the next, \$395; the next, \$120; the next, \$100; the next, \$90, and the next, \$85.

The traveling expenses of the societies reporting vary from \$1 to \$2,600; expense for postage varies from nothing to \$600; rent varies from nothing to \$600; printing bills vary from nothing to \$1,400; clerical help varies from nothing to \$1,041, one reporting expenses for "secretarial office," \$4,056.15.

Three of the societies have printed programs covering the year's work. The number of addresses delivered under the auspices of the societies ranges from none to 269. Fifty per cent of the societies have given dinners or lunches varying

from one to five, but this does not include lunches served at committee meetings. Nine receptions were given during the year. Eleven of the societies issued pamphlets during the year. Five have issued other documents; four have offered special oratorical prizes; eight have conducted oratorical contests, one society, specializing in this form of work, having arranged eighty such contests. Nine of the societies have interested themselves in the promotion of Peace Sunday, three of which advocate the Sunday nearest the 18th of May. Twelve work definitely in coöperation with other societies. One society reports affiliation with thirty other organizations. Four societies have tried to influence candidates for office. Fourteen have done their best to influence officeholders, particularly with reference to the arbitration treaties. Twelve constituent branches of the American Peace Society have coöperated definitely with the American School Peace League. Eight have attempted to maintain a lecture bureau; eight an information bureau; only one reports a special press bureau; eight others supply material for the press. Seven have issued a general annual publication; ten have issued special publications, as leaflets, folders, circulars, or contributions to magazines.

As a means of increasing the membership of the societies, eight report the most effective means to be individual solicitation; two report public appeals to be the most important; five consider public appeals to be second in importance; two consider personal letters second in importance, and four consider personal letters third in importance. No society has employed newspaper advertising as a means of acquiring members. Ten of the societies have general application blanks; two place them third in importance; three rank them fourth.

The facts so far gathered are too meager to warrant any very conclusive generalization, but, from as careful a study of our field as possible at the present, the Executive Director feels that organization for the promotion of international peace in America is most inadequately financed and relatively far too inefficient. Avoiding unnecessary duplication, there are, however, encouraging aspects of the work sufficiently tangible

to be reported. The societies especially emphasize the increased confidence shown in our work and statements by school and college; a growing friendliness on the part of public opinion generally; the fact that fourteen peace offices can exist and pay their bills; an increased demand upon the peace societies for services of various kinds; the spread of peace literature and principles; an increase in membership of the peace societies; a growth in the number of new peace societies; an intelligent awakening of business men and organizations to the importance of the peace movement; the coöperation of women; an encouraging interest among the Rhodes scholars.

DIRECTOR CALL:

We have heard from Mr. Beals, "some experiences in enlisting clubs and other organizations in this work." I have tried to bring to you some of the "facts in relation to the work in the field," as set forth in the report of the Executive Director of the American Peace Society. We will now listen to Prof. Hull, of the Pennsylvania Arbitration and Peace Society, who will speak to us on "An Efficient State Peace Society."

An Efficient Peace Society

PROFESSOR WILLIAM I. HULL.

The factors of efficiency in a State Peace Society may be considered under the following topics:

Organization, Operation, Coöperation, and Finance. I shall have time in this ten minutes' address to consider only the first of these factors, organization, and I will discuss it briefly from the international, the national, the departmental, the State, and the local points of view.

Since the peace movement which we are considering is designed to preserve the peace between the nations, it should be organized, in the first place, on an international basis. An efficient international organization of the world's peace societies is not yet completed. The Permanent International Peace Bureau, established by the Third International Peace Congress at Berne, Switzerland, in 1891, is now wrestling more

hopefully with this important problem than ever before; but the various national peace societies should endeavor more actively to assist the Bureau in a speedy and effective solution of it. Meanwhile, the peace societies within the nations must come, officially, into touch with the international movement through the medium of the national society, of which they are constituent members. The state societies in our own country, which are separated by such large expanses of sea and land from the peace societies in most foreign lands, should come directly into contact with, and thus draw guidance and inspiration from the international movement by sending personal representatives to each successive international peace assembly. For example, during the Summer of 1913, there are to occur in The Hague the following noteworthy occasions of this kind; the Twentieth International Peace Congress, the Eighteenth Conference of the Inter-Parliamentary Union, the Dedication of the Palace of Peace, and the First International Conference on Education.

The national organization of the peace societies in the United States is now happily under way, and the American Peace Society has made truly notable progress in this work since January, 1912. Its achievements along this line need not be dwelt upon or enumerated here; but the vital necessity of the completion of this task should be impressed deeply upon the consciousness of every state society, which should do its utmost to assist in the accomplishment of it. The old adage that in union there is strength applies with peculiar force to the promotion of the peace movement, confronted as it is by the hoary forces of warfare and by most of the selfishness of human nature as well. (The present is as truly the critical period in the development of the peace movement in our country as were the years from 1783 to 1789 in the development of our government; and E Pluribus Unum should be as truly our motto today as it was the guiding star and the great achievement of the founders of our national Union.

The departmental organization, which the American Society has undertaken and which already includes five departments, should be extended so as to include the eight

other departments which the Executive Secretary of the Society has projected, or at least should follow the national government's precedent of nine departments. It should not be forgotten, however, that these departments, like those of the national government, are purely for administrative purposes, and are in no sense constituent parts of the national society. The state societies are as fundamental in the peace organization as are the states in the national government, and the departmental organization should be purely contributory or subservient to the state societies. The great advantages which the state societies may derive from the departmental organization within which they are included, need only be mentioned here. The manifold multiplication of results through interstate coöperation, the sharing of financial and educational burdens, and the obviation of needless duplication of effort and expense, should enable the departmental organizations to pay for themselves in money and peace effectiveness many times over.

A long and rich history and many existing opportunities demand that the state society should be, with the national society, the fundamental factor in the peace organization of our country. To the state society also applies with peculiar force the lesson of united aims, methods, and resources. There is nothing more futile and foolish in the peace history of the past than the diversity of aims, the conflict of methods, and the dissipation of resources which have characterized the efforts of peace societies in some of the states. A hydra-headed and self-tormenting peace movement in a state is a moral monstrosity, and causes the general public to regard the agencies of peace with ridicule and the cause of peace itself with indifference or hostility. It may be observed that among the constituent societies of the American Peace Society there are at present three states in which more than one constituent society exists, one of these states with four, one with three and one with two such societies. This condition has arisen because of the exigencies of the past; but it is probable, and greatly to be desired, that it will be eliminated by future development in the direction of union. Thus far, twenty

states and the District of Columbia have been started on the road to an efficient organization, and the remaining twenty-eight states and the islands beyond the seas will doubtless enter upon it before the meeting of the Fifth National Peace Congress. That the policy of one constituent society for each state should be adhered to in this development is obvious for the reasons above given, and for the additional reason that genuine representation in the national society can be maintained by this policy alone. That clause in the Constitution of the United States which provides that "New States may be admitted by the Congress into this Union; but no new State shall be formed or erected within the jurisdiction of any other State . . . without the consent of the Legislatures of the States concerned, as well as of the Congress," should find a place also in the Constitution of the American Peace Society as applied to the constituent societies within the States.

As the states are the foundation of the Union, so the counties, or townships, and the cities, are the bone and sinew, the sum and substance of the state. The necessity of a national organization of the state peace societies is paralleled by the necessity of a thorough organization of each state society throughout the length and breadth of its state. No society which merely has its headquarters in the state's metropolis, and which draws upon that city or its suburbs alone for its members, directors and working force, can be called a genuine state society. Hence, local organization within the states is as important as it is difficult a task. Take, for example, my own state of Pennsylvania, with its eight million inhabitants, its sixty counties, and 146 cities of over five thousand inhabitants. Shall a branch, or sectional society be formed in each of these 206 localities? This would mean the creation of a new organization in each locality; and since the members of it would also be members of both the state and the American society as well, they might justly join in the prevalent Twentieth Century complaint of being organized to death. Again, how could undesirable duplication of effort and expense be avoided, as between the many branches of the state society? And shall the branch societies share

with the state society the dues of its members, even as the state societies share them with the national society? This would mean that of one dollar in annual dues, the national society would receive fifty cents, and only twenty-five cents would be left to the state society and its local branch, respectively.

On the other hand, could the machinery and expense of local societies in each of the localities referred to be avoided by the establishment of a local committee of the state society? I am personally inclined to the latter opinion. By a local committee of citizens actively interested in the cause of peace, guided by the officers of the state society, coöperated with by the society's executive secretary, and partly financed, if necessary, by the society's funds, a permanent nucleus of peace sentiment in the locality could be secured, a body under whose auspices local peace work could be engaged in could be created, and, at the same time, undivided responsibility and a consistent policy could be harmoniously maintained. The vital point in this form of organization would be the securing of genuinely interested and active workers to serve as the local committee. To maintain their interest and activity, the work itself, coöperation with the officers of the state society, and reports of work accomplished published in the *Advocate of Peace*, or in the state society's bulletins, would be sufficient. It would not be necessary that each of the committees in Pennsylvania, for example, should be represented on the state society's board of directors; nor would this cause be desirable from the point of view of the society. In the directorate of the society, an undue number and undue deadness should both be avoided. Geographical representation should receive, of course, due consideration; but a small, compact, actively working directorate is a *sine qua non* in a peace society as in an industrial corporation. Nor should there be an undue striving after mere "prominence" and "influence." A live donkey is better for most purposes in this world than a dead lion. A certain small number of mere names, provided they be really of weight in the state and nation, may serve some useful purpose; but as a general rule a directorate

should include men and women who participate persistently and faithfully in the actual work of the society, and do not content themselves with gracing letterheads with their names and annual banquets with their presence. However so humble there is no one so effective in the long run as an energetic and loyal worker. Of course, live lions, provided they will really pull the plow as well as roar and look imposing, are useful for more purposes than is the live donkey; and an earnest and determined effort should be made to procure a sufficient number of them; but unless, and until a directorate can capture a sufficient number of the kings of beasts—or of men, of such a type—it had far better work along with a board of humbler but more useful beasts.

The time and space allotted to me in this conference will not permit me to dwell further on the organization of a state society, or to discuss the other three factors which enter into its efficiency. But, in conclusion, I will advert for a moment to an agency utilized by the Pennsylvania society, which combines both the factors of operation and coöperation; this is the Pennsylvania Chautauqua Association. In order to extend the peace message to as many citizens of the state as possible, and especially to those in the semi-rural or semi-urban districts, the Pennsylvania Arbitration and Peace Society made an arrangement, financial and administrative, with the Chautauqua Association, by means of which one and, in some places, two addresses on peace and arbitration were delivered last year in forty towns of the state. The peace address was only one feature of a large and varied six-day program which included speakers of national reputation and musical and other popularly attractive features. The audiences to whom the peace address was delivered averaged about 800 people, and after each address a large amount of peace literature was distributed gratis among the auditors. By this means, some 30,000 people received the peace message in the form of both the spoken and printed word, and doubtless spread it in the latter form to many others. This year the Chautauqua circuits will include 105 towns, and the peace message will be delivered, both in the form of a lecture and in that of moving

picture films, to some 85,000 to 100,000 people. Next year, it is planned to include a much larger number of towns in the Chautauqua circuits and to add to the moving picture exhibit a debate on the subject of peace, to be participated in by speakers of national reputation, and perhaps an oratorical contest between students of colleges and high schools in the state.

I have cited this feature of the Pennsylvania Society's work as an illustration of the many and varied opportunities which are open to state peace societies to increase the efficiency of their work by coöperation with other existing agencies.

DIRECTOR CALL:

When you remember that the Pennsylvania Arbitration and Peace Society has opened official headquarters at Philadelphia, at 1000 Bailey Building, with a big man at the head of it, we are sure that the liberties of the people of Pennsylvania are safe.

The next speaker will address himself to the subject: "The Enlargement of Membership in Our Peace Societies." Dr. J. J. Hall, head of our South Atlantic States Department, will be the speaker.

Enlargement of Membership in Our Peace Societies

DR. J. J. HALL,

The subject assigned me is a very practical one. It affords no opportunity for the play of the imagination, nor for mere theorizing. Nor can it be presumed that the last word will be said here upon the subject, for what we may submit is simply suggestive, and I rightly suppose that not a few of you may have other, and perhaps better, plans for the enlargement of membership in our peace societies.

It seems to me that first of all we should be profoundly impressed by the fact that our societies need an enlarged membership.

This should be acknowledged without even a second thought, and yet it is by the reiteration of common, everyday facts that we come to realize their importance.

The thought of the necessity for an enlarged membership fully taking possession of us will have a stimulating effect in arousing us to make appropriate effort for that end.

Let us consider, then, a few of the reasons why this need exists.

The need arises, in part, from the losses that are constantly taking place among us.

It may not be pleasant to think of our losses, but they are real, nevertheless. Our leaders fall by the way; their day draws to a close, and their work here ends. We think today of some whom we knew, but they are with us no more; and those who are here can be here but a little while. Urgent, indeed, is the call to fill up the ranks and to take the place of those who have passed on before, men, and women, too, who served their day and generation faithfully. Only thus can we be true to them as we take up the work where they laid it down and bring in others to carry it forward to a final victory.

The necessity for an enlarged membership arises from the fact that only by this way can the cause be perpetuated. Our great cause—the cause of Universal Peace—can not live on its past history, splendid though it be. It can not accomplish its full mission in this day and generation. It must go on and on until all people shall see its light. But it is not self-propagating. It is all very well to say, "Truth crushed to the earth shall rise again." But truth must find its embodiment in form; it must find expression through human lips. No theory, no principle is self-perpetuating independent of means. A live and aggressive campaign must be waged or the cause itself will die, and grim war continue to slay its thousands and tens of thousands; to deceive the nations of the earth with its specious plea of necessity; to burden by a crushing taxation all people, and to fill the world with horror and strife.

The necessity for an enlarged membership in our peace societies is also seen by the many doors of opportunity which are constantly opening before us. I presume it is with you as it is with me. Could I manifold myself a score of times I could keep the whole busy all the time. To carry the work into the schools and colleges; to keep the public informed through the press, both religious and secular; to organize strong peace societies in every state of the Union, to get a footing for our cause in the different federations and unions; to interest persons of influence so that they shall be won over to our side of this great moral question; to get a hearing by the Chambers of Commerce and the Boards of Trade in the many cities of our country; to have the churches stand as a unit with us; to keep the fires burning on the altars of the peace societies throughout the wide, wide, world, all of this can not be done by a few. We need and must have a mighty army, for there are battles to be fought and victories to be won for peace; nor must we underestimate the forces which are still against us.

Now we come to the vital question: How to enlarge the membership of our peace societies?

1. There must be enlightenment.

We must impart information. There is no more potential force for this service than the printed page. When John Bright, Richard Cobden, and their collaborators changed (and that completely) England's tariff laws, they first of all sowed the country with Free Trade literature, and the Corn Laws were forever repealed in that land. What is true with a nation is true with individuals. The wise, generous distribution of peace literature will bring about splendid results. There may be need of a word of caution here. There is no sense in wasting ammunition, and much literature, good in itself, may be worse than wasted. Selection is necessary—strong, telling facts. Men are busy; women have such a little time; the daily papers are so large and full of exciting everyday news that in this rushing age many persons do not take time to read what they should, so that a marked copy sent through the mails, a live, racy article in the papers may

often catch the attention and awaken thought; and when people think they will join our peace societies. Popular education is the enemy of war, and the printed page is the great source of a people's education. Keep the knowledge of the horrors of war, the victories of peace, and the higher ideals of a nation, the brighter outlook for all lands, constantly before the people and they will enlist themselves on the side of Universal Peace, and give of their time and means for its promotion.

In order to obtain results I find it necessary not only to impart information, but also to awaken some enthusiasm.

We talk about cold facts. I have found that even facts need warming up in order to warm people up to action. You must stir, awaken, bestir some persons before you can get them to do anything, even though it be to join a peace society.

When living in Raleigh, North Carolina, one of the greatest preachers of the South, and perhaps of the world, related the following incident: Said he—"When the great fire swept through Chicago, rendering thousands homeless and in want, so that an earnest appeal was made to the world to send quick relief, I myself took a subscription paper and went first to a very wealthy member of my church to head the list. To my surprise he signed for a very small amount. Some little time afterwards we had a small fire in our city, in which the home of a widow was burned to the ground. To my astonishment the man to whom I had gone for help for the Chicago sufferers and who had given me such a little, started with a generous sum, more than treble what he had given me, a subscription paper and carried it around himself for the widow whose home was burned; and when I asked him how it came about that he gave so much in one instance and such a little in the other, he remarked, 'Why, pastor, Chicago is far away; but I saw that poor widow's house burn. I looked upon the flames, and heard the crash of the falling timbers. I saw that woman in her grief, I heard her cries on that night and my heart was moved to pity and to help.'"

Yes, we need to get people to see and to feel and to be moved to action.

This is one reason I believe in public gatherings, and by stirring speeches put the facts before the people and make a definite, clear-cut appeal, and there and then enlist for membership.

This was my plan at Raleigh, North Carolina. I meant to make Sunday evening, March 2d, a great time. The previous day we had our Peace Convention and effected our State Organization, and though at the convention proper, carefully prepared and fine addresses were given, I could hardly expect much enthusiasm, but with William Jennings Bryan, coming to speak for us on the Sunday afternoon; with the leading men of the state and city being invited to a seat on the platform; with the governor of the state, who is fully committed to our movement, to introduce the speaker for the occasion; with some splendid work which had been done by the press, in which Mr. Josephus Daniels, now Secretary of the Navy, had greatly aided us, I was not surprised to see a crowded house, to hear a great speech, to have the enthusiasm of the people awakened and to receive about 100 signed cards for membership in the society.

I adopted somewhat the same plan the following Friday at Columbia, South Carolina. My friend, Dr. S. C. Mitchell, President of the State University, had arranged to secure for the cause of Universal Peace a public hearing at Columbia, and invited Hamilton Holt and myself to present the subject to the people. Dr. Mitchell was untiring in his endeavors and had the hearty support of his young men; the result was a full house, and an enthusiastic audience. Mr. Holt charmed them by his truly great address on "The Federation of the World," I had the privilege of following him, and afterwards had cards circulated for signature, committing the signer clearly and definitely to the World's Peace Movement; and it may surprise you to know there were more than 300 cards signed, representing many of the leading men of the State of South Carolina.

It is true that this is only foundation work, and calls for following up through organization, but it is a great work. It brings out the friends of peace. It gives the best of material to

work with in a more constructive way. It is preparatory for greater things. So I say, bring the people together. Do it by your lecturers, clubs, lanterns, teas, suppers, moving pictures, circles, mass meetings, conventions, great and small; yea, in any and every way that will interest them and bring them out and awaken an enthusiasm for cause. And then strike for membership, and keep striking every opportunity that you have.

When all this is done I am fully persuaded that the most effective of all methods for the enlargement of membership in our peace societies is personal work; personal solicitations; hand-to-hand work; dealing personally with individuals. Circulars, letters, literature, public meetings—these all need following up by definite, personal solicitation.

Here I speak from experience; out of nearly 100 members I find that fully ninety-five per cent have come in by personal solicitation. Very few answer your letters, and many have I written. Not many persons come up after reading your latest article, and say to you, "Put down my name, here is the membership fee;" but somehow you may many a time bring them in by a call at their office and a personal request, made in a business-like manner.

For this end I have found it wise to prepare the way either by a letter or by sending on some peace literature. My general plan is to send on a current number of "The Advocate of Peace;" sometimes do this two or three months, and then make a personal call, soliciting membership. In this way, I have secured some of the leading citizens of the state; and while in Georgia we are only at the beginning, yet we have many of the first men in the city of Atlanta enrolled in the Georgia Peace Society, and in the American Peace Society.

In this work you will often be sorely disappointed, and after waiting and waiting to secure a person you will fail in the end to do so. Some whom you felt sure of gaining will give you a definite and positive "No." Others will regard you almost as they would "a book agent," and refuse to give you a hearing; others claim to be too busy to take on any more, and still others are opposed to the whole thing; they want a

large army and a big navy; and sometimes you may turn away with a sad heart. But who are we to falter in our God-given work? What great work has ever been carried forward without disappointment, and at times apparent defeat.

You will have much to cheer you. Often you will have words of encouragement and even gratitude. You will gain members of persons whom you little thought would join your society. You are helping to press on, slowly it may be, but surely, the coming of that bright morn when it shall be seen that "Out of the darkness of night, the world rolls into light. It is daybreak everywhere."

To say nothing of the immortals, who when here cleared a way for us, and today are watching us as we press the work forward; but here and now we have colaborers for whom we are thankful, and grand, brave leaders are ours. The very angels of Heaven are rejoicing over the work we are doing. Never shall our banner trail in the dust. We'll work on and on until the old prophecy is fulfilled, the hope of the world realized and war shall be no more.

DIRECTOR CALL:

The last presentation before the discussion is entitled, "An Effective Follow-up Work After the Peace Society Has Been Organized." Mr. Robert C. Root, Secretary of the California Peace Society, will be the speaker.

Effective Follow-up Work

SECRETARY ROBERT C. ROOT.

The more I study this theme assigned me, the more I am inclined to think that what I shall say would form a most suitable companion piece to one written many years ago in the office of the New York Tribune. It was composed by that veteran political editor, Horace Greeley, and its title "What I Know About Farming." It never became "a classic" on agriculture; and by the same token I am not expecting by the presentation of this paper to win a Carnegie Hero Medal or the Nobel Peace Prize. What I present is, laconically, expressed, a few bits of personal experience.

The one great problem in our work is, if I understand it, still unsolved; and worse still, I have yet to learn of anyone who has found out how to solve it. The problem is how to reach the multitude of indifferent, ill-informed, lukewarm souls who manifest no interest in our cause, and judging by all outward appearances feel no personal obligation in helping you and me to relieve them as well as ourselves of the curse of war and the burdens of militarism. This problem solved, our victory is won; but ah, there's the rub!

However, since I am one of those never-discouraged, never-give-up, stay-on-the-job, ever-hopeful, rush-in-where-angels-fear-to-tread sort of an optimist (not to mention some other possible and commendable characteristics), I am still willing to hammer away with the hope of sometime finding the weak spot in the enemy's armor; or, better still, probably, I am willing to try to reach the enemy through "the better angels of their nature," and thus reduce the opposition and eventually gain our victory.

Experience teaches me that development work is divided into two main lines of endeavor: First, to increase the income, or working capital of the peace society. Second, to make the propaganda thorough, far-reaching and effective. Distinct as these seem in theory, they often overlap or commingle in practice. It is often difficult, and in fact undesirable, to separate a campaign for new members or to solicit contributions for our work without doing at the same time some "peace extension work." On the other hand, experience again teaches me that the wise use of literature, of circular letters, of direct appeals through personal letters by explaining what we have done and what we propose to do; in other words, peace propaganda; these combined efforts will bring returns in cash ranging from fifty cents to fifty dollars. True, these contributions may be few and rather far between; but they come, and like the oasis in the desert, they cheer the heart of the weary.

The direct financial campaign, I find, naturally divides into two parts, the daily or continuous work that gathers in the "hand-picked fruit," and the public meetings of varied

character, where contributions are received, and from two to two score new members are obtained. The indirect financial ingathering comes, as stated in the preceding paragraph, from the judicious use of literature and pen and typewriter.

Experience teaches me, again, that follow-up propaganda work may be done in a great variety of ways. The peace man's card or button will often start the conversation into peaceful channels on the street, in the hotel or restaurant, in private offices and on the train or street car. If the button doesn't work automatically, the peace man can often unobtrusively "push the button." Then with "The Waste of War," or some other convenient leaflet always ready, the door of opportunity is entered and more or less interest awakened. Or it may be a proud foe is gently humbled by being brought face to face with facts and arguments that he can not answer.

Then the Peace Secretary, always gentle in his ways (?) gently knocks on the doors of Churches, Sunday Schools, Young People's Societies, Women's Clubs, Public Schools, Normal Schools and Colleges. The doors of opportunity invariably swing open, wide open, and 20,000 to 25,000 a year thus hear the peace message and many become adherents of the cause. Sometimes a few of the bolder type of souls venture into the peace fold and pay annual tribute to the cause.

The public library affords another opportunity for effective extension work. For example, the librarian at Berkeley, Cal., has placed in the library every book that the Secretary of the California Peace Societies has recommended to him, and they were not a few, as you can readily imagine. The Berkeley Library is widely patronized by the 52,000 citizens, the 1,300 high school students and by many of the 4,000 or more students of the state university. Many public librarians and high school principals have written me in response to my annual circular letter recommending seven or eight of the newest and best books. In each case, these officials thanked me for the list and promised to buy nearly all of them for the library or school.

Just now our California societies are about to issue a bibliography on nearly sixty peace topics, with three to ten

references for each topic. This bibliography has been prepared with especial reference to the growing demand of our high schools and colleges for material to use in their study of the peace movement or to prepare for debates and peace prize discussions of the peace question.

This last statement suggests another line of development, with the peace society as the radiating center, and that is the peace prize contests among the high schools and colleges. By this means in California we have in Shakespearean phrase, "bound to us with hooks of steel," a goodly number of high school and college students who are now staunch friends of the cause; and in a number of cases have become financial supporters of our peace societies.

Our propaganda work in California has also had some very helpful assistance from the daily press, and from the weekly and monthly periodicals. Whatever the secretary has had time to write for them, these journals have invariably published. More of this work is being planned.

The latest effort on the Pacific Coast has been the uniting of all our peace forces into one body, called "The Federated Peace Committee for 1915." Its object is to make every possible effort to arrange for the holding of the greatest peace congress ever held in America at San Francisco in 1915.

Another thing I wish to mention is the work we may do in the anti-Japanese agitation on the Pacific Coast. If we peace people are "on our job," to use a common phrase, we could turn the light on that trouble most effectively, I believe. More people have come to me asking about that, and going away with some information, at least more than they had before. I find truly, and I don't say it in order to throw bouquets at ourselves, the opposition people know less than any people I have met about that question, and the peace people are the best informed on that of any people I know. Such a man is President Jordan, and such men are some of our other strongest peace advocates. We can use that knowledge most effectively in counteracting some of the things some of our would-be legislators are attempting to do. I hold no

brief for the Japanese. They can represent their own case. But we can do more than anyone else to help the people to throw light upon that question. I thank you.

DISCUSSION.

DIRECTOR CALL:

We are privileged to have with us the Secretary of the American Peace and Arbitration League. I will call upon him to lead the discussion.

A. B. HUMPHREY:

Mr. Chairman and Fellow-Workers—I declined an invitation to go automobile riding this afternoon. I went without my lunch, coming out of another meeting in this building which I was very anxious to attend, for the purpose of accepting the invitation to be here, because you know and I know that it is not only the man behind the gun, the man up on deck, but the man who makes the peace machine go is the man in the executive chair, that is the secretary or executive officer.

I accepted the invitation in the spirit in which it was given, and put in an appearance at great personal disadvantage to myself, as I was unprepared. First, because I don't stand upon your platform, either because your platform is too narrow, or my feet are too big. This is a place for open-hearted discussion, I take it. I think we ought to state here, because the efficiency of the organization which you have started depends upon correcting an error which was made some time ago when this organization was started, that is when the Carnegie Foundation came in with the American Peace Society, and it was made distributing officer. The organization to which I belong, the American Peace and Arbitration League, is not a member of this syndicate, for this reason: When we made application to come in, which we thought was the proper thing, without sacrificing our platform or ideas, we came in the same spirit in which I came here, to interpret and modify my views by what I heard here, because I may be an extremist, and I want to help modify the views of some of you gentlemen I know are extremists. That is why

I am here. We were told by the office—fortunately not the genial gentleman who presides here today—that we could not participate in the American Peace Society arrangement, unless we came in under the New York Peace Society, or local city organization. It appeared to us, being a national organization, an international organization—with the President of the United States our honorary head, and all of the living Vice-Presidents of the United States belonging to our society, many Senators and Congressmen and people all over the world interested in our organization—that we could not sacrifice—particularly since we were the first society in the United States to be incorporated—that it would not be dignified for the American Peace and Arbitration, League, as a national and international society, to sacrifice that position to come into this organization by way of the local New York City Peace Society, great as it was, and that we could not do it. Therefore, we are not members of your society. I am not here to talk about coming in today, gentlemen. I am here, and I will always be here when I am invited in the spirit in which I was invited today. What we want is to present a solid front when we get down to Washington. Let us march up Pennsylvania avenue elbow to elbow, so that when we get to the United States Senate Committee on Foreign Relations we can say, “We are here in unbroken phalanx that knows no enemy in its own ranks.” That is the spirit in which we want to go to Washington. I think we have missed in this convention in some way what is really the essential thing to keep in mind. I made the statement to President Taft, that the men who can help make peace treaties are not necessarily the peace societies. In Washington there are ninety-six Senators if I remember correctly, and two-thirds of the Senators of the United States plus the President of the United States make the peace treaties. Here a treaty with Japan expires and we make a new one. Those men make it, but we don’t. We may have something to say about it, but they make the treaties. The treaty with Great Britain expires in June. The question of the Panama Canal has been postponed until December. There is going to be a terrible fric-

tion. We have got to concentrate our forces upon the United States Senators and the President. What we want is to get together. We have had some excellent papers, and I think Dr. Hall has summed up very accurately what we ought to keep in mind—organization, coöperation, and finances. I don't remember who treated the question of the waste of distribution. Now we are treading on the high cost of living, but I think that is one of the questions for you to consider, the waste of distribution.

If you want criticism from the outside as to some things, I think you have too many wheels in your machine. You have a state organization, a national organization, a county organization, and a township organization. That is a splendid idea, but it takes more than sixteen thousand dollars to carry the proposition through. The organization you people have mapped out should receive from the Carnegie Fund at least a quarter of a million dollars to carry out the plan. My point is, since you have not got that appropriation, can't some system be devised to utilize the different peace societies without taking so much steam and energy to run a great big machine? The individual man that takes a wheelbarrow, with one wheel, can handle that wheel perfectly. That is the capacity of the individual man with the wheelbarrow. The question is whether some of us can drive six horses where we are only used to the other way. Our friend referred to the fact that he would rather be a live mule than a dead lion. I think I would make a different selection of animals, I would give up the dead lion and banish the mule, and take the plain, common, everyday work horse, with horse sense. That is the fellow that does the work. You gentlemen are at work. You are not dead lions or live mules, but workers. You are the men and women that understand this peace work, and are doing the work in your own way. When we get away from St. Louis, let's keep in line. The organization in the United States is worthy of the cause of the Prince of Peace, whom we all try to follow. The essential question is not what society is getting ahead of some other society, or how much this society is spending, or how many members it has, but how

many people can you muster on the peace question, how many votes can you get in the United States Senate, how much influence can you have with the President of the United States, and how much influence to counteract jingoism springing up out of this Japanese matter?

One more criticism: That is, that the literature published, as a rule, to my mind, does not reach the spot. I believe we miss people, the best people, who would naturally belong if they were properly informed and if we were not quite so radical.

For instance, I stand for an adequate army and navy. I am perhaps too radical at times. Four or five battleships—I simply want the natural protection every man wants, and that is to preserve our institutions and liberties, and nothing else.

Now, the peace forces, including the literature we have, the speeches we have today and the papers we get out tomorrow morning will arouse antagonism of people who believe as I do, and they are in the majority in this country. You may say what you are a mind to, but the last Democratic Convention at Baltimore and the Republican Convention at Chicago, representing ninety per cent of the voters of the United States, put in their platform declarations for just exactly the things I contend for. It does not do to antagonize these people, because these people represent a power it is possible to make advantageous for peace. Why should this convention antagonize that influence by everlastingly talking about the horrors of war? God knows we all know what it is. The literature of my child life made my life miserable with the detail of such things. I have tried not to exaggerate along that line. It seems to me that the beauties and the glories of peace are the things to talk about, not the bloody annals of war. It seems to me those are the lines along which we should proceed and along which we can proceed with the greatest efficiency. And I include myself in anything I say. I came here to get inspiration to help me. I know what is in your hearts, and when you and I meet I can shake hands joyfully and cordially. When we go out we can coöperate. I don't carry a gun in my pocket, I carry a warm heart beat for each and everyone of you, and

that is the spirit in which I came here today, and the spirit in which I hope to come every day, regardless of how much we may differ in nonessentials.

DIRECTOR CALL :

Is Dr. Hill here—Dr. John Wesley Hill? He was invited to be here. Is Mrs. J. E. Cowles here, the Chairman of the Peace Committee of the General Federation of Women's Clubs? Mrs. Moore, she is not here. Will you speak a word for her?

MRS. PHILIP N. MOORE :

I am very sorry, indeed, that our chairman is not here, because I know of how much value it would have been to her in the work we are attempting to carry out, working for an organization of a million women, endeavoring to influence public opinion in this matter of peace. We believe that the mere love of peace and the hatred of war will mean nothing to us unless we have such educational propaganda, and as our organization is purely an educational organization in all lines of work, we realize it is coming to be not only a question for us, but for all the people, and we want to gain from this organization all we can. Therefore I regret most sincerely that she is not here. We have obtained from Dr. Jordan and Mr. Krehbiel various syllabi, the work which Mrs. Cowles is introducing in the clubs. We have also received from Mrs. Mead the literature she is sending out. I want to bring one point to your attention. That is, shall we form organizations in these federations, or shall we come in absolutely as individuals into the various state peace societies? And while on that question, I will ask, are there peace societies in all the states?

DIRECTOR CALL :

There are not.

MRS. MOORE :

We have a very strong federation, in every state in the Union, and each one is taking up the subject in an educational way. Nevertheless, we want to know what is being done in

all these peace societies, and I should like to ask the chairman whether we ought to come in as state organizations or clubs, or whether we should come into the state peace societies as individuals. That is a question Mr. Weatherley brought up and interests me very much. Shall we come in through the state peace society?

DIRECTOR CALL:

Do you wish me to answer that question?

MRS. MOORE:

Yes.

DIRECTOR CALL:

In the states where there are peace societies, it is the policy of the American Peace Society that all section societies, such as this would naturally be, join the state society in the state where that section naturally would exist. If there is no state society in that state, then that section could become a member of the organization.

MRS. MOORE:

It might be influential in forming a state society, I suppose?

DIRECTOR CALL:

Undoubtedly.

MRS. MOORE:

I think that is the case with the Missouri Society. I believe we were very influential in forming that society. We hope before our next convention we may be able to take steps that will be of more help to you. I wish I had heard Mr. Beals.

DIRECTOR CALL:

That will be printed. So you can have it.

MRS. MOORE:

In the discussion perhaps something else may be brought out that I shall want to speak about.

MR. MEAD:

Before speaking, I would like to ask whether in securing the one hundred members in North Carolina for the North Carolina Peace Society, and the three hundred in South Carolina, whether the one hundred in the one case and the three hundred in the other came in on precisely the same basis and paid the same, one dollar?

DR. HALL:

At the time, those who came in in North Carolina paid the fee. The meeting that was held at Columbia was not exclusively the American Peace Society. All we desired then was an expression on the part of anyone present in favor of arbitration, and simply asked pledges that they were for arbitration rather than for war, but we did not take everyone under a membership vote. In fact, we have not organized the state society for South Carolina yet. Does that answer?

MR. MEAD:

The answer suggests, I think, whether on the question of this membership it is worth our while besides trying to enlarge the direct membership of the state societies to see if we can not enlist, by gathering expressions of opinion from thousands of people everywhere, men who are essentially one with us, who might constitute a peace party, as is being done in the suffrage agitation. The first thing that confronts us is, of course, the fact that the total membership of all the peace societies in the country at this moment is so small. I suppose everyone of us who has looked over the annual report for the year is humiliated—I know Mr. Tryon and I are—to know that all the combined peace societies in the United States at this moment have not a total membership of five thousand. This work has been tremendously organized, and I think if a lot of us went at this work of membership more energetically we could do it. ? ✓

We neglect one tremendously important class, and that is the class that is the biggest, and who have the votes—the class of workingmen. ✓

If anything has cheered me more than anything else, it is that the Federation of Women's Clubs is coming into our

movement, making our cause its cause, and I predict from that great body we shall have, within two years, more members added to the membership of the peace society than we have at this moment.

Mrs. Mead and I spent Sunday in Buffalo, and had good audiences, hundreds of people, and yet there was one man that was appealing to the workingmen that I believe will have more effect in creating votes for our cause than all the seven speeches appealing to others than the working classes.

President Butler said a fundamentally important thing the other night in New York, when he said that when we defeat a Senator for election to the United States Senate, then the people at Washington will sit up and take notice. We have just had an election for Senator in Massachusetts, and it accuses the best people, and I number myself among those accused—and I worked harder than most people there on that subject—that we did not send a first-class peace man there instead of a third or fourth-class peace man there, because in the present condition of this country in reference to politics and arbitration, it would have amounted to more than all the peace conferences.

We have got to take this along into politics if we are going to do anything, and we have got to take into consideration the workingman. Every one in politics knows very well that we are going to have multitudes of members in Massachusetts, New York, Missouri, and other states, and when we have them well organized and brought together we have got to teach them that they must not look to the Carnegie Endowment to pay their bills. I think the Endowment is all right, and I thank God for its existence, because it enables us to do our work every day, though it has its faults. It makes people think this movement has got all the money it needs, and that they need not exert themselves. We must not look to the Carnegie Endowment, but to the people. When it is made a cause like the Christian Endeavor and the Christian Association causes, then we shall conquer. Mr. Humphreys and I are good friends, but we do vary, and you know why—because he lays stress on what he calls adequate enough—but where we do agree let's work

together. If we want to establish treaties in Washington let's do it; but he knows well enough when he talks of the jingoism of Japanese warfare there have been men in peace societies who have been prominent in spreading Japanese scares in the United States, and he knows very well that the man in the street judges the Governments and their sincerity by the fact as to whether they are decreasing the machinery for the settlement by force with a rapidity corresponding to the great rapidity with which they are providing for their settlement with the machinery of law and reason. If they don't do that, the man on the street accuses them of insincerity. And the tragical thing is that the terrible multiplication of the machinery of force has gone on faster than the machinery of justice. We have got to look at these things fairly. Where we can work together, let's work together. Let us have a campaign to rake in members, not by the score, but by the thousands, and the best work will be done by this course in Missouri, as was tried in Chicago and New York, and they tell me you can have here a local association of a thousand members. It is the function of this great Congress to manifestly increase the membership, and to carry on the work when and where we can.

DIRECTOR CALL:

We will now hear Mr. Arthur L. Weatherley, Secretary of the Nebraska Peace Society. Mr. Weatherley has done on his own hook effective work in state organization and what he will say to you will be the result of experience, and I am sure will be of interest.

MR. WEATHERLEY:

When we talk about safe and sane, we mean people who will agree with us. I want to say in beginning you know the working people, the plain people, that are not connected with any societies at all, have gone to figuring out how a man is actually in favor of peace and at the same time in favor of war. The movement is not going to grip the ethical consciousness of the people, unless with these fine ethical dreams you can make them feel there is some great need. I have had this put to me. "You people talk about peace; look at us!" The peace move-

ment has got to appeal to them. If the people do not believe in the movement they will not be in it. The peace movement today is not an argument against war. That has been our thought. There will not be any more great wars. We know it. It is absolutely settled. That is percolating through the great masses of the people. It is not a question or matter of argument. We are never going to get anywhere on this basis of a dollar membership. I am thoroughly convinced of that. I have worked to do it. I have not much time—I am in a thousand other things—but I have put in all the time I can. I have appealed to all sorts of people. I sent last year to half our membership three separate personal letters, in order to get them to renew. Some of these people are my personal friends, and many of the women that did not renew are most active in the State Federation of Women's Clubs. I suppose we will have these societies for many years to come, and they are the nuclei for active work, but we ought to devise some method. I have been trying to figure out some way for a year. We should have three classes. One class through which we ought to be built up will get the Advocate of Peace. I don't want to criticise anybody, but the Advocate of Peace ought to have a lot more ginger in it. It is all right with the academic folk, but its message does not go to the plain people.

MRS. MOORE:

May I interrupt a moment? You didn't tell us what "ginger" is.

MR. WEATHERLEY:

There is a little paper called the official organ of the English Workingmen's League. If you will take that paper you will get my idea. At any rate, that is my feeling about it. The great mass of the people are not favorable to war. They are in sympathy with the movement. Get the working people. Get into the towns and organize meetings. Call and hold meetings, if you don't get a dollar. In some of these little towns they are afraid we are going to take something away from them. I never expect to take away more than ten dollars at a meeting, but I don't tell them that in advance. I do believe we

have got to find some method of getting the names of the men and women interested in the movement. We must understand that the time has come when we must take up this sentiment and concentrate it on the next political issue that arises. Then there is a way in which I believe we are wasting—I get all kinds of literature that ought never to be sent to me; for instance, pamphlet matter, sometimes three or four copies of the same pamphlet matter. This shows me we are sending it to the people already converted. If I had the money I would find somebody who could syndicate the stuff, like the Scripps-McRae, or a newspaper association of some kind, and get it on the front page. I know people in the peace movement who could syndicate that stuff and get the actual facts. I am not a newspaper man. I believe the time has now come when we ought to get the facts primarily before the people in regard to the wickedness of spending a tremendous amount of money in preparation for something that will never happen.

DIRECTOR CALL:

We will now hear Mr. Hunt.

MR. HUNT:

It is now late and I will not take much of your time. I did not come with any prepared speech, because I did not know until the last moment whether I would be able to come. I was very glad to hear Dr. Trueblood this morning. After years' of experience, having grown gray in the service of this movement, he gave us some very valuable ideas on the peace movement. Mr. Root, my good friend, in his paper, said the crying need of the times is the proper organization of the peace forces, or something like that. Now, a great deal has been said this afternoon about the organization of peace societies. I can not attach the importance to peace societies that has been attached here this afternoon. It seems to me like it was about thirty or forty years ago the spread of the peace propaganda through peace societies took place, and I am of the opinion that that time has gone. There are three ways in which I believe the peace forces can accomplish their objects. The first is this: I have a scrap book at home that is half filled with clippings,

going on to show that the manufacturers of war material are influencing war scares, and actually bringing about military preparations. That was stated in Germany just recently. They said they thought the United States was the only country in which such things happened. If this is so, there is a vast amount of work for the peace forces in this country. We ought to set apart a certain amount of money for detective purposes, to ascertain whether or not it is true. If this is so, we have got the whip over them and can lash the country into peace. If it is not so, we want to know it.

The second is this: The inadequacy of our principal peace publication, the Advocate of Peace. It is not edited along any of the approved modern publicity lines, not such as any publicity man is proud of. It is wholly inadequate as a propaganda sheet. It goes to people who largely believe in peace. We have got them now. We want to get the great public. We ought to have a magazine containing general data, pictures, a little fun—something that could be sold on the news-stands and on the trains. Pick out the very best that is said, instead of publishing the whole story, as is now published. And that journal could be made self-supporting. There is no reason why that journal should be a drain upon the peace forces. The proceeds from the journal should finance the Peace Movement. As long as the Peace Movement continues to be a movement it should not be a charity. Let's make it self-supporting. It can be done.

The third point I would raise would be this: I would divide the peace activities of the American Peace organizations into two parts: The first one for general propaganda work. Let everybody do peace propaganda work as he or she sees fit. Some men's influence will do more good in one year than the whole peace society for fifty years.

Then let there be another branch, just as distinct from the one as the legislative and executive branches of the Government. That second branch would try to obtain politically that for which we are working—a great need Mr. Mead has already spoken of. We ought to have a peace representative in every Congressional district in the United States. That man would

be responsible for the vote of that Congressman in that district. Here is a Democrat, Republican, or Progressive, running in that district. That man would look up the records of these men, and find out what they believe on peace and arbitration, and find the strongest man of those three for Congress, and put the facts properly before the electors of that district, and then, too, for the Senators. It would be very easy to perfect a fine working organization of that kind in which all peace people would be willing to coöperate. It is regrettable that this propaganda of the American Peace Society has not been carried on recently, and in fact up to the present time, in such a way that the society of which I am a member can subscribe to it. *Trueblood*

MR. WEATHERLEY:

A fellow named J. H. Douglas, who publishes a little country paper at Auburn, Nebraska, every week, is doing a good work for international peace. His paper is "The Granger." He hasn't got any money. He has about a thousand subscribers, and I can't tell you how many hundred letters that man got signed and sent to President Taft commending him for his interest on this proposition, and he has kept that thing up for more than a year, and gets all sorts of people to send and pays the postage. I think he is a real hero. I know another fellow that will go all over the country and get hundreds of people to sign a paper.

DIRECTOR CALL:

There are two propositions I want to speak about; one with reference to the Advocate of Peace, and the other with reference to non-paying membership. I want to say to Mr. Hunt that the Advocate of Peace has been published since 1834. It has grown gradually of its own vitality through all these years. In the last twenty-one years, since Dr. Trueblood has been its editor, it has doubled its circulation, without any advertising, thirteen times. It may be true that there is room for a popular magazine in the interest of international peace, but there is also room for a trade journal for those who are studying this matter seriously, for the specialists, and for

the college, the university and the library, such as the Advocate of Peace already is. I don't mean to say he can't edit the paper better, but I do say it has been an ably edited paper, and has gained through all these years on its merits.

On the point about non-paying membership, it strikes me we have had some experience on that. Two years ago, when the arbitration treaties were being advocated, we sent out a hundred thousand copies of the Advocate of Peace. Those copies were sent by us to people whose names had been sent to us by people in the field, our secretaries, and so on, and the other day we went over that list and found a large percentage of them had moved, some had died, and that list, gotten out a little over a year ago was practically useless, and we threw it away.

MR. WEATHERLEY:

You can buy advertising lists. In our country they figure only about fifteen or twenty per cent movement a year.

DIRECTOR CALL:

But here is an experience we had within two months. The Maryland Peace Society came to us and said: "We would like to negotiate with you for an extra edition of ten thousand copies of the Advocate of Peace to send out in the State of Maryland." They gave us a list, or as they supposed, a list of persons in Maryland, who would be interested. It was a list they themselves got up and sent to us. We sent the ten thousand copies of the Advocate of Peace to those persons. The very next day we began to get returned Advocates of Peace, sent back with the usual Postoffice notations, "Address wrong," "No such person," etc. We had a tremendous per cent of lost Advocates. Now, the result of this is that my mind is a bit skeptical of any list of persons, non-paying persons, or of the value it would be to our propaganda. If we have a specific thing before us at Washington, then we can get up a list which is alive and use it then, but it begins to deteriorate at once, so far as value is concerned, and you have got to get up another list. So I do not feel that you could have a permanent list of non-paying members.

MR. DEFORD :

I just want to make one remark, along the line of frequent visits to Washington. I find that in the press gallery there is a representative of the navy, practically a publicity advocate, and of course he is opposed to this idea, and his work in the press gallery, both of the Senate and the House, is such that he is creating an atmosphere of prejudice. It probably will come to your attention that when a certain Congressman comes on the floor reports are sent out that he is shut off, or lightly received, and so on, these reports coming through the press, these very reports of the publicity agent. Of course we know the peace movement is becoming a political issue. We know before the anti-slavery issue became a political issue it was a moral issue. We have reached the point where a moral question has been threshed out and has become a political issue. It seems to me that the peace organization should maintain a publicity agent. I don't think it is known generally that the navy people have a publicity agent, but it is a fact. I know him very well.

Along the line of organization I might say it is very important that the states be well organized, and it seems to me, with the experience I have had politically, that the best way to go at that is to adopt the tactics of political methods. We want to bring pressure upon Senators and Congressmen. When the lower House is attempting to build a great number of battleships, the pressure is needed there. When the Senate refuses to adopt treaties, we need the pressure there. And the only way that can be done is by an elastic organization like a political organization.

We have today the stupendous organization of a new party. It is planning the organization of the twenty-four hundred counties of the American Union into committees, county committees, state committees; the Congressional committees are practically organized, but the county committees are not, but they go to the foundation, the subdivision of the county. It seems to me that by organization of committees of that kind, which really are not active except when they are

called upon, is the only practical way of getting at it, by centering our forces upon some point.

DR. J. J. HALL:

It is not possible fully to estimate the good that is being done by the American Peace Society. It is reaching out in many directions, and you may have heard of some of the major results. For instance, we sent a petition to the school board of Atlanta a few weeks ago, asking that they observe a peace day in the public schools. They had never done that before, but they will this year, and that will bring forty-two thousand of these children in direct touch with the peace work. I went before the Federation of Workingmen, the Federation of Workingmen's clubs of the Southern Department, I suppose representing about two hundred and fifty thousand, taking in the whole of the Southern States, and had the privilege of addressing them. They have passed unanimously resolutions standing by the peace cause.

When the Baroness Von Suttner came to Atlanta, I had a large amount of literature from Mr. Mead's office, and the ladies took these by hundreds and thousands. You can't measure the good it is doing. You can't bring about universal peace in a day. It is largely educational. Let us all work, and keep working, because the object we are aiming at is worthy of all we give it. We have got to stand together. It is a great work, but you can not bring about results at once, and the only way is to recognize the good that is being done, and push the work a little harder.

MR. ROOT:

I can agree with my friend Mr. Hunt on some points, but on some I can not. I can see where an article in a popular publication could reach certain classes I know, but in my state the Advocate of Peace is a splendid journal for students to have to get material for their debates, and that which they can get nowhere else. There is a place now for the Advocate of Peace, and there is also a place for a more popular journal, with short, crisp, brief items, not essays or addresses. There might be a place for that, but I still believe there is a splendid

work for the Advocate of Peace. I have found it so in my work, as I said, and I would not like to do without it. I would like to see a paper with short discussions, and illustrations, for the worker who has not time to sit down and read these long articles. It is another type of publication for another type of readers, and yet there is a large field for the Advocate of Peace, I think, and it ought to receive aid for the great work it has done in the past. I have seen the need in California for the Advocate of Peace, and the other publication we need too, but I don't know where the money is coming from to publish it.

DIRECTOR CALL:

Of course, we must not forget that a great deal of that popular presentation is going on all the time, through the popular magazines. The newspapers are taking up our work with increased avidity, as you know. If you could sit in a chair in the Colorado Building in Washington, and see the press clippings that come in from all over this country, representing the change in public opinion away from the institution of war to the institution of justice, you would have an idea of what is being done in that line.

This meeting this afternoon has demonstrated exactly what might be expected of the value of just such a conference. One of the great weaknesses of the movement is that we do not know each other. To hear you get up here and talk, and to get your point of view, to hear your voices and look into your eyes, is stimulating to me. I go out from the meeting with the feeling that I have gotten something I could not have gotten in any other way. I am sorry the United States is so big that we can not have meetings like these at least once a year. I am not sure but what we ought to get up a fund to pay the expenses of the workers in the field, so that they might get together for one, two, or three days, once a year, for the purpose of discussing the practical problems of the field. To me this has been the most stimulating and the best meeting I have attended. I think good things will come out of it. In this way we get a complete understanding of each other, and it is very interesting to me, for example, that Mr. Humphreys should take the attitude he did this afternoon, and that Mr. Hunt should be here,

and we should get acquainted with their views. Mr. Humphreys is not here, but if he were I would say the same thing. He has not felt that the organized peace movement was a very effective organization. He has not, therefore, been very much in sympathy with our work. He believes in an adequate army and navy. (Well, I don't know, but what we all believe in an adequate army and navy.) I don't know what "adequate" means, but while Mr. Humphreys considers and while the Navy League of the United States considers an adequate navy to be larger than the one we now have, I hope their conception is not some such topheavy military system as is burdening the nations of Europe today.

MR. WEATHERLEY:

Why say the nations of Europe? Why not say the Orient?

DIRECTOR CALL:

What I want to say is that this has been an inspiration to me, and I am glad we could have such a meeting, and I hope we will have others like it in the future.

INTER-AMERICAN RELATIONS

SECTION MEETING

Thursday Afternoon, May 1, at 2 o'clock

ST. LOUIS UNIVERSITY AUDITORIUM

HON. RICHARD BARTHOLDT, Presiding

MR. BARTHOLDT:

Ladies and Gentlemen—The representatives of the Latin-American countries, who are honoring us with their presence, prefer to speak to you from the ground floor.

In opening this meeting, I wish to say that there is probably some misunderstanding in regard to these meetings on the part of the public. I suppose the newspapers have failed to report the fact that these section meetings are all free to the general public, and that is probably one of the reasons why, in this present instance, the quality of those present will have to make up for the lack of quantity. It was our intention to honor the presence of the diplomats of the Latin-American countries by a large crowd, but under the circumstances I venture to express the hope that they will not judge our cordial friendship for them by the slim attendance of this meeting. I hope they will go back to Washington with the feeling and assurance that our hearts beat warmly for all the people living south of us. We want them to be satisfied that we consider them as being on a basis of absolute equality with us. We can not and do not claim any superiority simply because we are a stronger and more populous nation. And we want them in return to respect and appreciate us, not because we are more powerful, but because the sentiments of their North American friends are worthy of their respect and appreciation.

I believe we have paid too little attention to the great countries south of us; at least, in the past. Let us hope that with the completion of the Panama Canal a change will come

upon us; that we will look upon our Latin co-laborers as our friends and neighbors, and will cultivate their friendship, will increase our mutual trade relations, and, above all, unite upon a common basis our future peaceful relations.

It was a splendid idea, in my judgment, that at the last Baltimore Peace Conference the name of this organization was changed from the National Peace Conference to the American Peace Conference. That means not only the United States, but it means America, North and South. It means, in other words, these meetings will in the future be truly Pan-American conferences.

Now, I take very great pleasure in introducing to you, as the first speaker, Señor Don Ignacio Calderon, the Minister of Bolivia to the United States, who is one of the most popular guests; they are all popular in Washington, but Señor Don Ignacio Calderon is one of the most popular speakers in the National Capital.

Our International Opportunity

SEÑOR DON IGNACIO CALDERON, Minister of Bolivia

Ladies and Gentlemen—I do not expect to take much of your time, but only make a few remarks to express my satisfaction to have on this occasion the honor of voicing, as a Delegate from Bolivia, the sentiments of its government and people of unreserved adherence to the great cause of international peace, advocated in this Fourth American Peace Congress.

My country, in common with all the other republics of South America, has had its periods of painful internal disturbances, and in consequence thereof we have been deprived of our sea coast and suffered the loss of much valuable territory; but the lessons of that hard experience has had its salutary influence; we are now orderly and peaceful, pursuing the task of developing our means of transportation to make available the abundant resources with which Bolivia is blessed. We are struggling to have easy and cheap communications between the high plateau where our immense mineral wealth

is centered with the extensive eastern grazing plains and the great tropical forests over which nature has spread such bountiful variety of products; but railway construction is not an easy matter where the highest and most rugged chains of mountains bisect the country in all its length and when over an area of more than three times as large as that of the German Empire we have scarcely two and a half million inhabitants. We feel the necessity and are anxious to receive the current and vitalizing influence of immigration, that is doing so much for some of our neighboring republics and has done so much for the United States. Therefore we are perhaps in a situation to appreciate more keenly the importance and beneficent influence of international peace. The republics of this continent having established the legal equality of men, discarding the unjustifiable class privileges that in the Old World has been the cause of many wars, have opened their territories to the peoples of Europe and invited them to find in democratic America free and happy homes.

That the Western Hemisphere is even now the most advanced exponent of the practice of international peace is very plain. We need not go back to those long centuries of interminable wars that have cursed the old world nations; but just let us look, say to the time elapsed from the last half of the 19th century to our own days, and will find a remarkable showing.

The United States has had only one international war from 1850 to this day, and that war is very much to its credit as it was fought in order to help Cuba obtain its liberty and independence. In South America we have had two international wars; one between Brazil, Uruguay and Argentine against Paraguay, and the other between Bolivia and Peru against Chile. During the same period, commencing with the Crimean war, we have seen in Europe many a bloody conflict, some of them having been carried into Asia, Africa and even to America, when the invasion of Mexico, in the unfortunate attempt to establish there an Empire, and the sending of a fleet of Spanish men of war to the Pacific in the wild dream of reconquering the former colonies.

I may remark here that besides all the various international wars, Europe felt the convulsions of many internal revolutionary movements, far more serious than the disorders in some of the republics, that have not as yet succeeded in overcoming the revolutionary evil.

Europe is the great luminary towards which we turn for inspiration in every branch of intellectual, artistic, scientific and literary progress. We owe to it our civilization; but it is very difficult for that great continent to shake off the unfortunate predominance of dynastic interests, historic prejudices of race and religion and antagonisms that centuries of rivalry have produced. It takes time and the growth of progress to create new interests, new points of view and more humane conception of the right and just relations between the family of nations.

It is plain that the whole trend of our civilization bespeaks of peace. We do not construct railways for the sake of transporting troops more quickly, or establish telegraphic and cable communications to flash declarations of war. The welfare of mankind as a whole is the final expression of the industrial and commercial growth of the nations. Wars affect in our days as much the belligerents as the neutrals.

On the other hand, we are becoming every day to understand better that the moral laws of the universe are general and comprehensive in their effects, and, therefore, if it is a crime to kill a man, it can not become a virtue because it is done wholesale, under the guise of national honor. This country has given to the world more than one example of its high political and moral ideals. Nowhere the movement in favor of international peace is stronger and more popular. I remember very well the deep impression I received the first time I had the good fortune to attend the Lake Mohonk Conference. It was not so much the natural beauty of that charming place, nor the genial and open hospitality and sweet expression of that great old man, unfortunately departed, Mr. A. K. Smiley, to whose memory I am glad to have this opportunity to pay this passing tribute for his noble work; but the personnel of the people there congregated was a revelation to me.

Judges of the Supreme Court of the United States, and other courts, admirals of the navy, generals of the army, university presidents, great business men, ministers of all kinds of religious denominations, citizens from all over the states and a number of noble women, who in this country take a lead in every movement for the welfare of mankind, and are deserving to have every legal right, were congregated at Lake Mohonk as the apostles of the new crusade, to survey the progress of the cause; to find the means of promoting it and getting ready to go forth and spread the good doctrine of human charity and peace. The meeting was the expression of the noblest aspirations. Nobody, even the most cynical, could detect there the slightest trace of commercial or private interest. It was the reflection of the conscience and aims of this great democracy, the powerful standard bearer of the cause of peace amongst all the nations of justice and right in the world.

Afterwards I have had the privilege of attending some other meetings such as this, and every time I become more and more confirmed in my confidence in the spirit of justice or what more generally you call the square deal in the American people. May that spirit always abide here and become more general and universal. This country has no peasant class or any other class, but a body of free citizens of a great democracy, equal in their rights, interested in their country's development and progress, perhaps too eager to make money. I see no privileged persons here other than the children and women, who are ever active in the good work for the betterment of mankind.

Liberty and right are not empty words to be placarded in the highways and the byways, or to adorn the head lines of the newspapers; they are and must be a living and active force, way deep in our conscience and the guiding force of our actions.

The United States is to me a unique nation in the family of nations of the world. Born under the inspirations of the spirit of freedom of the Pilgrims; educated in the practice of self-government, and finally organized as the greatest democracy that ever existed; endowed with a territory that is almost

a continent ; rich, fertile, well watered and open ; developed by the concourse of men of almost every nationality, it stands today as the beacon light of freedom. Great and materially powerful, its mission is to be yet greater as the leader in the noblest ideals mankind strives to attain.

The heavy war armaments that burden today the most important nations will only crumble down under the pressure of the public opinion, strongly vitalized everywhere by the conviction that justice and peace are the true road to our welfare and happiness, guiding us to that eternal bliss which is the crown of our divine mission. (Applause.)

MR. BARTHOLDT :

We are honored with the presence of the diplomatic representative of the great Republic of Peru, and it affords me great pleasure, without taking up any more of your time, in introducing His Excellency, Federico Alfonso Pezet, Minister of Peru to the United States.

Mutual Confidence and Respect as a Basis for Peace Between Nations

SEÑOR DON FEDERICO ALFONSO PEZET

Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen—It is a very great honor which has been paid me, in requesting me to deliver an address on the occasion of the meeting of the Fourth American Peace Congress. But it is truly fitting that the representatives of Latin-America should be called upon to participate in this gathering, that they should be allowed to record their sentiments in behalf of an idea which is of paramount importance to nationalities that are still on the threshold of their material development, and that require the blessings of peace, internal and external, to reach that condition of prosperity through progress which is the desiderata of all peoples.

The Latin-American is generally misunderstood ; very rarely is he appreciated in his true value.

The histories of our countries and of our peoples have never been studied in this country, or for the matter of that,

in Europe. While every educated Latin-American knows the salient points of the histories of the United States and of the European nations, and he would, indeed, be considered grossly ignorant if he did not, you, on the other hand, not only ignore our history, but you look upon it as of no consequence, and can not see any value to you, in a knowledge of it.

It is this attitude of superiority, due to an absolute ignorance of our peoples and their true characteristics, that has created a sort of estrangement between the two great families who inhabit this continent. Both here and there this estrangement is manifest in many ways.

It is a most unfortunate thing for all concerned that such a condition should exist.

Peace and good-will among nations, as among individuals, depends in great measure upon their mutual understanding and forbearance. The neighbor who irritates us, because of his strangeness to our way of thinking, can become our friend only when each of us understands and appreciates the limitations which impose the differences.

Therefore, it behooves us to exert every influence, to seize each opportunity which is offered us, to do away with the prejudices that divide us, to grow in the true knowledge of each other, that we may each understand the virtues of the other and become neighborly in the sense of the words of the Divine Master, the Prince of Peace.

In one sweeping statement our peoples, as a rule, are shorn of every trait of character that goes to make up a nation. Our faults are looked at solely; our virtues, and we have many, are ignored. We have been dubbed a race of procrastinators, lazy and unruly, every ready to fight amongst ourselves, and lacking in all sense of proportion.

I am an assiduous reader of the daily press. I likewise read many of the works that are edited here and in Europe on the subject of Latin-America, and I must confess that the literature that is turned out is, in most cases, of a nature to give false impressions to the unbiased reader.

Our countries and their possibilities are depicted in glowing colors, the many opportunities that they offer as ample

fields for lucrative investment are presented in a manner most attractive, but we, as a race, as a people, as a family of human beings, striving to attain our betterment, working in and for the general uplift, we are consistently ignored and the only reference to us is of a nature to convey impressions which tend to lower the estimation of impartial men in regard to us and to make them believe that the one great fault in the paradise presented to their consideration lies in the men who inhabit it, to those on whom such beautiful and great natural gifts have been bestowed and who have shown themselves unworthy of them, and unfit to utilize them to their greater advantage.

Consequently, we are looked upon by the great mass of the people as devoid of the essential qualities necessary to the making of a nation. This permeates the greater part of the public references to some of our smaller nationalities.

Gentlemen, this is a wrong attitude to assume towards us. If you would but take the trouble to study our histories, if you would but deign to try to know us through personal acquaintance, and to become familiarized with us as a people, these erroneous conceptions which have estranged us would disappear in a short time and a feeling of trust and confidence would take their place.

It is this general attitude of you towards the Latin-American that has created in our people a sentiment of mistrust in you. On our side, we do not know you, at least the great mass of our people do not know you, due to your attitude towards us, and because of an unfortunate class of your men who have striven to present you as of a type which I am pleased to declare is not truly representative.

Throughout Latin-America, while the European has been trying to help us along by loaning us his money, by assisting us in our natural development, in many instances allying himself, through marriage, with our people and blending himself with us in every possible manner, the few and far between men of your country who have come to us have in many instances assumed an air of superiority, and even of downright contempt. They have not tried to learn our traits, they have not made any attempt to study us, or to know us, animated by one

desire, governed by one impulse, dominated with the sole object of making money, of getting in a shorter time, than would be possible at home, the wealth which they have set out to acquire. Of course, I do not mean that all the Americans who have gone to Latin-America are of the type described. Many of them have been men of high and commanding personality, who have helped us along the path of progress and shown us the proper methods which we should follow in national development, but these have been the exception, and so while we remember and honor such as have done pioneer work, our people as a whole have been brought more often into contact with men of another class, men who have not cared what opinion was formed of their nation through their dealings with the natives.

Peace and good-will amongst nations, to be lasting and enduring, must rest upon mutual trust, and no such thing can happen when the peoples which constitute the family of nations are not acquainted with each other.

Therefore, I return to my premises—it behooves us to exert every influence to attain a true knowledge of each other, to understand each other, to learn our characteristics and to be lenient to each other during this process of mutual recognition, so that in time, and by assisting one another, we may create a true bond of friendship between both families and thus establish a basis for a perpetual peace amongst the nations of our continent.

In the three Congresses which have preceded the one we are now attending, and in this one, everything has been said in behalf of peace that can or could be said. Men of unquestionable superiority, men who have attained prominence in the world, in every possible field of human activity, have voiced sentiments which are worth recording and have proved by their works and deeds that they are truly imbued with the sentiment of love towards humanity, which makes for the uplift and betterment of the human race, so there is nothing for me to add which would not appear as trite or commonplace, when not a repetition of something that has been said

before, in terms and manner more eloquent and convincing than any which I could attempt.

But as the drop of water furrows the rock, we must be unceasing in our endeavors to carry on the work which we believe to be right, so that our little drop of earnest endeavor may bring about, in sooner time, the condition of peace which we are all striving to attain.

The American world stands today on the threshold of a new era. The magnificent undertaking which is now nearing completion, and which is destined to bring closer together many of the nations of this world, and more specially my country with your country, should find us working strenuously and enthusiastically in behalf of an All-American peace-understanding—a Pan-American entente cordiale. The achievement, the greatest engineering work of man, should be celebrated in a manner more enduring, more significant, than by mere shows, pageants and expositions. By all means let us have these, but besides let us have a conclave of our world, our American world, and proclaim these to the outer world, the new Gospel of Peace on the basis of America for the Americans, the North for the North, the Central for the Central and the South for the South. All for all and each for the other, without misgivings, without mistrust in full desire to be neighborly.

Therefore, my message, at this meeting of men and women, all striving towards an ideal, all working together to attain one and the same end, can be summed up in two words, Education and Confidence.

Through education we, of this American Continent, can become acquainted, and becoming acquainted, confidence in each other and mutual respect will be the result.

So, I say, that the greatest benefactor shall be the man who will help the spreading of education, teaching the people of one country to know other people, to forbear and to trust.

MR. BARTHOLDT:

One of the first lessons we learn in the Kindergarten of Peace is to be honest; honest with ourselves and honest with

our fellowmen. If we are honest and just, we will have to admit that the criticism just now passed upon us by His Excellency, the Minister of Peru, is fully merited and well founded. Let us pledge ourselves right here, and even in his presence, that in the future we will do better.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, I take great pleasure in presenting to you the representative of the youngest Latin-American Republic, the Minister of Panama, Mr. J. E. Lefevre.

The Isthmus

J. E. LEFEVRE, Special Delegate for Panama

Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen—I come from a land of peace—a small country which attained its independence from Spain without recurring to war, although it shed the precious blood of many of its best sons on behalf of the freedom of our southern brothers; and later on, when it made its appearance before the family nations as a republic, it was done in an equally peaceful way.

Nature everywhere in the Isthmus of Panama invites to peace. Its beautiful skies, the brilliant colors of the waters of the oceans that surround it by north and south, its magnificent tropical vegetation, and almost everything else, contribute to bring the human heart closer to our Creator, and getting nearer to God means loving peace.

The extraordinary geographical position of the Isthmus is, by itself, a symbol of peace, for it has been for centuries the connecting link which unites the northern and southern sections of this continent, and union means peace. Further on, when tomorrow our Isthmus shall be cut in two and the land shall be divided, the world will be united through the marvelous achievement of progress, which also means peace, carried through by the unlimited energy and high intelligence of the greatest nation that has ever been known.

The flag of Panama means internal peace between two old militant parties which were so deeply separated between themselves during our association with our neighbors to the south. Red represents the Liberals, blue the Conservatives,

and white their union through peace; and when it came to the necessity of drafting our Constitution—which is of an advanced character—it was the result of a compromise of the representatives from all political factions, so as to remove any possible cause of division.

Our national anthem is a song to progress and to national harmony, and its sweet melodies, instead of inspiring warlike sentiments, are an earnest invitation for the development of the higher ideals of civic duty, which also means peace. In our escutcheon we have, it is true, a cannon, but it is dismantled. We have also sword and a rifle, but they are both carelessly hung as useless weapons of manslaughter; and in another side there appear, in a different position, some implements of labor and the winged wheel of progress, representing peace, which noble word expresses so fittingly the meaning of our motto: “Pro mundi benefitio”—“for the benefit of the world”—beautiful sentence which embodies the sentiments of the people of Panama.

I can not refrain from referring, once more, to the splendid work which American brain and money are pushing ahead in the Isthmus, with the willing, earnest, and sincere co-operation of the Panamanians, who have never let pass by any opportunity of rendering whatever assistance there has been in our hands that could help to make possible the accomplishment of the wonderful undertaking of bringing together two oceans as well as all the nations of the globe.

We hear there, in the Isthmus, the deafening thunder caused by the most powerful explosives known to mankind, but instead of bringing ruin and devastation to humanity, they are changing the mountains into valleys and the lowlands into hills so as to make passage to the vessels of all flags, and to bring every country closer to the other.

We see there, in the Isthmus, a brilliant staff of military men, but they are not planning the conquests of the sword; they are winning the victories of peace, and furthering the conquests of commerce and civilization, which also should mean peace. We see there a gallant soldier, Col. Goethals, receiving full recognition from his native land on account of

the battles which he has fought, not against his fellowmen, but against the natural forces which he has had to meet and to overcome. We also see Col. Gorgas getting credit from his countrymen for fighting mosquitoes instead of men, for saving human lives instead of destroying them; and we have seen, with gratification, that the whole world has done due honor to both men.

Yet it is not only in the present that our Isthmus has come forward as a vast field for peaceful attainment. I do not want to molest your attention with the recount of minor details, but I will only mention the fact that the greatest man that Latin-America has produced, and who was a far-seeing genius, Simon Bolivar, chose Panama for the proper site of the first Pan-American Congress that ever was planned, and he foresaw the great influence that the Isthmus would always have, as an invaluable factor for the cause of peace and brotherhood in America.

Panama has not lost its unrivaled opportunities for said advancement of peace and brotherhood, in this continent, which "Libertador" foresaw. The dream of Bolivar can become a certainty by proper wisdom of all involved. Our special and close relations with the United States are—and should always be—an unquestionable example of the sincerity of purpose which prevails in this great country towards its neighbors, for the United States desires—notwithstanding our material weakness—that the relations with Panama shall always be distinguished by a spirit of fairness and justice which will prove the good faith of this nation, and must bring unlimited confidence to those other republics which may still have their doubts about the loftiness of the policy advocated by the foremost men of your government, in representation of the true ideals of the American people.

I will finish by stating that I have been delighted to frequently hear, from very many of your distinguished fellow citizens who have visited my country, that when they return to their homes they bring with themselves a message of love and good will from our President, who, as the foremost representative of my countrymen, is always much pleased to extend

to you a warm hospitality, as the able congressman from St. Louis, Mr. Dyer, vouchsafed last Monday before the "Million Population Club." Every one of the many Americans of note who goes to the Isthmus turns to be—when he comes back—a powerful agent of peace, because he carries back with himself the knowledge of another people, and knowing each other means better understanding, and better understanding means peace. Let us, then, endeavor to know each other better every day, so as to have everlasting peace among ourselves.

MR. BARTHOLDT:

There is another great treat in store for us, and I take great pleasure in introducing Mr. Charles E. Beals, the Director of the Central-West Department of the American Peace Society.

From Jungleism to Internationalism

CHARLES E. BEALS.

When the organized peace movement first started, ninety-eight years ago, its efforts were devoted largely to showing the immorality of war, and its chief appeal was to man's moral nature. Perhaps it is safe to say that all really great reforms begin with the moral. It is only in the later stages of a reform that scientific formulation becomes possible, through the accumulation of sufficient data. It was perfectly natural, therefore, that in the early days of pacifism, while some really excellent work was done along historical, economic and statistical lines, the principal emphasis was laid upon the ethical, and the chief appeal was to man's sense of right and wrong, to benevolence and pity. This, however, does not in the slightest condemn the movement. Any reform, to be a real reform, must have, at the heart of it, the eternal issue of right and wrong.

There are times when no argument but the moral is left to reformers. For example, if ever there was a group of people utterly whipped, it was that little handful of Boston abolitionists, at the time of the kidnaping of Anthony Burns. Their

defeat was complete. The "interests," South and North, were jubilant. But in such an hour of darkness, that inspired prophet of righteousness, Theodore Parker, dared to stand up and predict that a day would come when might should not make right, even in gold-governed Boston. And the day did come, before many years, when Parker's prophecy was fulfilled and his moral faith justified.

So it was with the little group of choice-spirited men who banded themselves together to organize international peace, just as Napoleon's devastating career was drawing to a close. Militarism was in the saddle, in Europe at least in those days. Science, and especially social science, was not yet born. The only weapon for those brave souls who enlisted to wage "war against war" was moral argument. Their only hope of success was a hope born of faith in the moral integrity of man, the universe, and God.

Happily so much water has flowed under the bridge since the organization of the first peace society in August, 1815, that pacifists no longer are shut up to a single appeal. The cause is no less a moral one than when it was first launched. It is still a moral issue, but it makes its appeal from many vantage points today.

For instance, the new science of international law, which is so rapidly taking definite form in our day, affords a most encouraging approach to the subject of permanent world peace. Peace societies and peace workers are in closest fellowship with international law organizations. Indeed, it was because of an extended tour through Europe, by Dr. James B. Miles, then secretary of the American Peace Society, that the first International Law Society in the history of man was formed, in 1873. And our own phenomenally successful and influential American Society of International Law had its inception at a Lake Mohonk Arbitration Conference. It is the most natural thing in the world, then, that members of peace societies should be represented, as they are, in the membership and on the programs of international law societies, and upon the governing and editorial boards of international law journals. It will be seen at once that international law

necessarily is a very close and powerful ally—or we may say department—of pacifism.

Thus we might continue. There are innumerable viewpoints from which to study pacifism today, and almost innumerable reason-weapons available for use in the campaign against force-warfare. But the modern pacifist never feels safer or more gladly optimistic than when, beneath his feet, he perceives the granite foundation of physical and sociological science. And it is upon pacifism as a science that we shall think as we survey man's steady upward climb from jungleism towards internationalism. We shall deal not so much with dreams—though constructive dreaming needs no apology—as with plain, prose facts, and try to get at the scientific meaning of said facts.

Science tells us of the principle of canalization, meaning thereby that as any living being goes on in life, it cuts for itself a channel. Deeper and deeper this channel or canal is cut as the hours or the days or the years or the decades or the centuries slip by. Every living thing is changing. New species are being formed all the time. Old species drop out. Permanence of species has passed out of modern scientific thought. Life is a flowing stream, and variation is universal and inevitable. Yet, if you can discover in what direction an organism is evolving, you can scientifically predict the future of that organism, for its life channel determines its direction, and direction is prophetic of destination. This principle of canalization probably holds as true of human beings and human institutions as of any of the smaller or less important organisms. Our problem, therefore, in discussing the possibility or probability of eliminating war from human society, is to discover the direction in which man has moved and is moving. Knowing man's direction, we can scientifically forecast his future. This will be the single task and object of the present study, namely, to attempt to discover the direction of human evolution.

To determine the direction of human evolution, up to the present time, it is only necessary to begin with the earliest human beings of whom we really scientifically know, and

follow man's history through the hunting, pastoral, agricultural and commercial stages down to our own day. If one will but take time to trace the stream of human history from the jungle down (chronologically), to our incipient internationalism of 1913, the direction of man's course will be evident enough. And, once having ascertained direction, the probabilities of man's future will be unfolded before our eyes.

Now, then, to our task. Up to a few months ago, the earliest human beings of whom we possessed actual scientific data, were certain cave-dwellers, whose bones were preserved in caves from the glacial period until discovered by modern scientists. The Neanderthal bones, found in 1856, in West Germany; the Gibraltar skull, dug up in 1868; the Sipka jaw, discovered in 1882 (in Austria); the Spy Cave skulls, which came to light in Belgium in 1887; the Heidelberg jaw and various other finds—all these enable us to form a fairly intelligent idea of early man. And now, from the gravels of Sussex, in England, have been taken bones of a man which reputable scientists assure us is as much earlier than the Neanderthal man as the Neanderthal man is earlier than man of today.

What sort of a being was this early man? If the question had been "what sort of a beast was early man?" it would have been equally true to fact. For, from the shape and size of the bones which have come down to us we know, scientifically, that early man was not yet erect in stature, that he had a very low cranial contour and a (relatively) small brain cavity, an ape-like jaw, almost no chin, a very retreating forehead, great circular ridges of bone around the eyes, and that he had not yet acquired the power of articulate speech, since the protuberances to which are attached the muscles used in speaking, are entirely lacking in the ancient skulls now in our museums. He was a brutish, repulsive beast, just "an animal among animals," as one anthropologist puts it.

Of the daily life of this early man-brute we have record in the bones which have escaped the tooth of time. He lived by killing. He had to kill to defend his own life against animals larger and stronger than himself. In the same caves from which the human skulls or skeletons have been taken,

were found the bones of cave bears, cave hyenas, saber-toothed tigers, the woolly rhinoceros, etc. By learning to hunt in packs, like wolves, glacial men were able to exterminate even such huge beasts as the mammoth. Not only in defense of life, but for food was early man forced to kill. And, in all probability, when the prey was once taken, the human hunters struggled among themselves for its possession. With the same crude weapons with which the early human hunter slew the lion and the bear, he slew his fellow human hunter. Nor is this all—the victorious human hunter doubtless ate his human victim; for, in some of the caves have been found human bones charred with fire, and cracked open, evidently for the purpose of extracting the marrow. Man fought man for the possession of food, hunting grounds, flint beds, or for the defense or capture of women and children.

When, after an unthinkable number of generations, man ceased to live in cave and jungle, when he began to keep flocks and till the soil, thus climbing upward from the hunter state to the pastoral and agricultural, he could not leave fighting entirely behind. There were backward tribes and peoples who still preferred to live by fighting, instead of by toil, and who coveted the fat flocks and golden harvests of their industrious neighbors. And so, in self-defense, even the most advanced had to fight on. Thus war and peace developed together.

What was the result of this primal struggle for existence? Biologically it was good. The weak perished, while the strong survived. The strongest men mated with the handsomest women and the result was the survival of the physically, and perhaps the intellectually, fit. Thus, though nature was "red in tooth and claw," the race improved, generation by generation.

Speaking from the standpoint of international peace, has the race moved up or down since the day of jungleism? Is man headed away from war or is war to be his perpetual and unescapable lot on earth? Let us confine ourselves to facts, and not allow our wishes to determine our interpretation of the data.

Jumping over innumerable centuries from man's first emergence from jungleism and the hunter stage, to the bustling, bristling present, what do we find? Instead of small tribal groups we see a half hundred steel-clad nations. Vast standing armies are maintained in times of peace, permanently withdrawing, in Europe, some three to five millions of men from productive industry. Immense battleship fleets and war debts mortgage the economic and physiological future of unborn generations. War is waged by machinery. Mechanical inventions and scientific discoveries are applied to the art of wholesale man-killing. In one short month, from the time the Montenegrin prince fired the opening shot in the Balkan war, one hundred thousand able-bodied young men had been killed or partially shot to pieces.

In spite of the fact that the biological result of the modern man-made warfare is bad, that selection is reversed, that the physically fit are drained off from industry and parenthood, while the weaklings become the breeders; in spite of the fact that whole peoples are impoverished and under-nourished in order that armaments may be kept up or increased; in spite of the fact that gunism is biologically unscientific and economically wasteful; in spite of the fact that the common people pay the bill—and a big bill it is—yes, in spite of science and humaneness, the so-called great nations, at this very moment, are cutting their people to the very bone for ever-increasing fleets and armies. Does this look like progress away from war? Or is all this simply a proof that the stoutest habit which man has brought with him from the jungle is the fight habit? And are not Krupp cannon and dreadnaughts simply improved jungle weapons with which the human race eternally must arm itself to the end of time? "There always has been war, therefore, there always will be," reasons the militarist philosopher, and he points to the modern rival armaments to buttress his argument. Is the militarist right? Is his interpretation of facts correct? Or does he ignore a set of facts which are not less real and are even more important than naval appropriations and sixteen-inch rifles?

True, to eliminate war would mean a radical change in society. Yet radical changes have taken place again and again. Up to within a century one might have argued that "slavery always has existed, therefore, slavery always will exist." Such an argument is out of date today. Other equally radical reforms have been effected and still others will be effected, in the course of man's social evolution. In the light of the progress, intellectual and moral, which humanity thus far has achieved, what is the probability of the elimination of the waste and barbarities of international war?

Without wishing to ignore the ugly fact that during the present twelve months the "civilized" nations will spend between two and two and one-half billions of dollars for war purposes, may it not be that before long man shall come to regard the war system as intolerable? Let us look behind fleets and armies to the people. Let us see the things in which they are most interested, the activities which they are carrying on, the appeals which most strongly influence them.

Six facts, among others, are significant for us, as we study man and try to determine in what direction he is moving.

1. Wars are less and less frequent. War is the exception today, whereas it used to be the normal state of nations. Mr. Emerson held that "all history is the record of the decline of war." Measured in money spent for war purposes as compared with appropriations for other purposes, war seems to bulk larger than anything else. But measured by the number of wars, war has become increasingly infrequent, and this is more and more marked as each succeeding decade slips by. Peace is today the normal state and war the very rare exception. For most peoples, cannibal expeditions are a thing of the past. Moreover "bishops' wars" and "ladies' wars" have had their day and dropped out. Since economic ruin and national suicide are the almost inevitable price of declaring war today, as has been shown by Bloch and Norman Angell, nations hold back from war as never before in all history.

Bloch tells us that from 1496 B. C. to 1861 A. D. there were 227 years of peace and 3,130 years of war; that is, there were about 14 years of war for every year of peace. Novicow

speaks of 8,000 wars. Ferrari has counted up some 7,000 revolutions which have taken place in Italy since the break-up of the Roman Empire, and each of these revolutions meant a war great or small. History records a Seven Years' War, a Thirty Years' War, a Hundred Years' War. It is well-nigh impossible for us to whip up our imagination to conceive of the state of society which these names of wars represent. There was a continual "fighting and flocking of kites and crows," to borrow Milton's words. In England the Hundred Years' War scarcely closed before the War of the Roses began. In Holland the "Cods" and the "Hooks" devoured one another for a century and a half. In our day, each succeeding decade registers an ever-increasing infrequency of wars. And were it not for the "interests"—the army and navy men who covet promotion, and the war supplies corporations which covet dividends—we should soon cease to hear of wars. For warscares, perennially trotted out when a military and naval appropriations bill is to be jammed through, are only bogies, paraded forth to terrify the immature.

When the prayer, "Give peace in our time, O Lord," was first inserted in the Anglican liturgy, it was, as Sir Henry Maine tells us, "obviously a prayer for an unusual and unhopèd-for blessing." Today it is highly improbable that any person in the Western Hemisphere north of the Rio Grande, or in the more advanced countries of Europe, ever will see war brought close home. Consider what this means, by contrasting contemporaneous conditions with the post-Reformation days when the entire "Christian" world was drenched with human blood. Yet less than three centuries have passed since the Treaty of Westphalia put an end to religious wars. Is not the trend of history unmistakably away from war? The greatest "war lord" in Europe has occupied the German throne for over a quarter of a century and never has led his nation into war—nor will he, for if he does the Lord and the Socialists will take his throne from him. But, prophesying aside, for the present, suffice it at this point to call attention to the increasing infrequency of wars.

2. Moreover private war has been abolished altogether. I wonder if we take in the immense significance of this statement, brief as it is. In feudal times, any noble could declare war against any other noble and summon all his kinsmen and henchmen to help wage it. Would you see and understand feudalism at a single glance? Then picture to yourself a great baronial castle crowded with armed retainers ready to fight for their lord against a neighboring lord. One old German land pirate of the fifteenth century used to boast that he himself had conquered and burned 177 villages. And this was only a sample of what every "noble" was doing under feudalism. If a crag-baron brought a war to an end it was only to gain time to catch his breath before going at it again. And even this breathing-time was spent in plundering travelers and peasants; for, as you remember, the value of an estate was determined by its location, that is to say, by the opportunities which it afforded for holding up travelers and looting farmers. But normally my lord crag-baron was actually engaged in wars, big or little. So numerous were private wars, and so ruinous their effect, that in Germany the utter extinction of society seemed impending.

How was the world delivered from this awful scourge of private war? It was not thundered out of existence by the church. To be sure the church did establish the "Truce of God" and utter some few feeble protests against war. But the unpalatable fact is that the lords of the church were as big sinners as the "secular" princes. Time and again ecclesiastical princes buckled on sword and armor and, with spurs jingling and sparkling below their churchly robes, mounted horse and led their troops into battle. This was especially apt to occur if some generous slice of fat territory was the issue, for in those dark days the land greed bacillus could not see very clearly and was as likely to get into the system of a holy prince as of a secular baron. The world still would be rotting in the gangrene of private war if it had been forced to depend upon the church for adequate remedies for that dread disease.

How, then, did human society free itself from private war? Simply in this way: During the past 300 years, and especially during the past century, there have been evolving great nations. With the birth of nationality, feudalism dropped out and private war dropped out with feudalism. There was no place left for crag-barons, and with the passing of the crag-baron the earth was delivered from the curse of private war. Thus in a perfectly natural and unescapable way, private war, which had existed from the time when jungle men first learned to band themselves together in groups, dropped out entirely and forever. Private war "always had existed," but the day came when the economic and political and social needs of an ever-advancing race required that it should be laid aside, and private war went. Truly this is no small gain.

3. Again, to a most encouraging degree, war itself has been mitigated. Whatever, in times past, war was or was not, today it is a great game. And the players have found it convenient (not to say necessary) to adopt certain rules for the playing of the game. The realm of war has been narrowed in several ways. The time was when neutrals had no recognized rights. If two nations went to war, other nations were embroiled. If you did not line up as a friend then you were looked upon and treated as an enemy. As an outsider you had no rights. Rights vested in belligerents alone. It is otherwise today. Rights are vested in the neutral, while belligerents are looked upon as disturbers of the world peace, or as pugilists who must keep within the roped ring.

Even when international fisticuffs are engaged in by two angry nations, the public opinion of the world, as codified in Hague conventions, requires the due observance of the rules of the ring. While formerly no distinction was made between combatant and non-combatant, modern war is waged only against armed enemies, and, even then, only after official public declaration. Thus today non-combatants are safeguarded even to the extent of the Hague agreement not to bombard even an enemy's unfortified seaboard city. Manifestly, some ground has been gained since the days of Queen

Bess, during whose reign a Drake or a Cavendish could attack cities in lands with which England was at peace, put the inhabitants to the sword, burn the houses and carry off all movable treasure; or capture the treasure ships of a friendly power.

Let us recall a few war incidents just to see how curiously out of place such deeds would be today. In Roman triumphs the captive kings were not only put to death, but tortured before being killed. The "holy" Crusaders massacred the inhabitants of Jerusalem upon capturing that city. When war was on between Russia and Sweden in Gustavus' reign, Ivan's soldiers would sell captive men and women for a few pence. After a certain victory they tied to stakes the survivors of the captured garrison and roasted them alive. After suppressing the Peasants' Revolt in Germany, in Martin Luther's day, the nobles probably put to death 100,000 peasants and no doubt would not have ceased when they did but for the fear that there would not be peasants enough left to till the fields. When Tilly captured cities like Neu-Brandenburg, Heidelberg and Magdeburg not only was the entire garrison put to the sword, but such scenes of license, murder and horror ensued as to be unfit for description. The last named city, Magdeburg, in three days after its capture, was reduced from a population of some 30,000 to 2,700. Oliver Cromwell, the praying soldier, in suppressing the Irish revolt of 1649, put to death a captured garrison of some 2,000 soldiers who had surrendered, besides some 800 civilians and priests. When the British marched from Boston to Concord on the 19th of April, 1775, they fired into half of the Whig dwellings as they passed. Even so late in history as Wellington's day, the Iron Duke permitted the sacking and pillage of a captured city. And the suppression of the Sepoy Rebellion was accompanied by such acts as the cutting down in cold blood by English officers of men who had surrendered, or the shooting of their living bodies from the muzzles of cannons. Just to mention these incidents is to remind ourselves how greatly the rules of war have changed in a single generation. In contrast with such unrestrained atrocities consider the ultra-scrupulous observ-

ance of modern usages by the Japanese in the Russo-Japanese war.

The Red Cross movement also has helped to ameliorate war. Beholding the awful sufferings of the wounded after the battle of Solferino, Henri Dunant gathered together little groups of volunteers to minister to the sufferers. Then the idea was organized, accepted by the nations in 1864 and 1868, and in 1907 the rules governing land warfare were extended by the Second Hague Conference to apply to naval warfare. So that today one finds it much more comfortable and agreeable to earn his living by being killed than it was before Henri Dunant started the Red Cross.

Nevertheless, it is difficult to repress a titillation of the funny bone when one considers one aspect of the Red Cross. Not for one moment would I belittle the splendid services rendered by the Red Cross on such occasions as the San Francisco fire, the Messina earthquake, the Cherry mine explosion and the Ohio floods. Such relief is statesmanlike, scientific, humane and altogether praiseworthy. Unfortunately one gets the impression from reading the reports of international Red Cross conferences that relief work in time of peace is quite secondary—mere practice work—as compared with the real Red Cross work which functions only upon the field of battle. Here is the humorous inconsistency—first deliberately and with scientific skill partially shoot to pieces 10,000 or 100,000 able-bodied young men, and then turn around and, in the name of humaneness, appeal for relief funds. In this age when science knows that hygiene is better than pills, prophylactics preferable to therapeutics, prevention more effective than cure, can we not see that the best way to relieve the suffering of wounded soldiers is to hasten the organizing of permanent international peace? For, if you push to its logical conclusion that spirit of humaneness which prompted Henri Dunant to organize the Red Cross, you never can be satisfied to tolerate the infliction of preventable sufferings upon human beings through war which in our day has become entirely unnecessary.

Let us close our survey of the facts concerning the mitigation of war with a single characteristic quotation from John Fiske: "Warfare, once regarded as the only fitting occupation for well-bred men, has come to be regarded not only as an intolerable nuisance, but even as a criminal business, save when justified on the ground of self-defense. And along with this change in the moral estimate of warfare, we observe that whereas the capture of a town not long ago was invariably followed by a carnival of red-handed slaughter and bestial lust, it is now thought unfair to kill the pigs or the chickens of a non-combatant enemy without at least professing to pay for them."

4. Another fact bearing upon the problem of war is this, that people are learning to think in economic terms. Frederick the Great used to say that an army, like a snake, moves upon its stomach. 'Tis true, likewise, of the human race. It was bread hunger, or economic necessity, which sent the children of Israel down into Egypt; the desire for economic betterment sent them back into the Promised Land. The same force drove the barbarian hordes down upon Rome. It is the same force which has brought millions of immigrants to America, and the same force sends them back to Europe in periods of hard times here.

As the people increase in number the available lands fill up until no more land remains; then the bread problem becomes more and more serious. Threatening starvation drives men to intensive farming, to new and improved methods of agriculture, to the search for new foods hitherto unused. Most of all we are driven to search out the leaks in world housekeeping with a view to stopping those leaks. No economic student need go very far into the subject before discovering that one great leak in world housekeeping is war expenditure. Some two billions of dollars the nations expend every year for rival armaments. The Commission on the Cost of Living, appointed by the Massachusetts Legislature in 1910, discovered that from 1776 to 1910, the United States expended some twenty one and one-half billion dollars for all departments of national government, of which sum over sixteen and one-half

billions went for war, leaving about five billions for all other branches of the federal government. The direct expenses of the principal wars from 1793 to 1905 aggregate more than twenty-three billion dollars. During the past generation the military preparedness of the European nations for the European war which has not come has cost the people of Europe more than the entire estimated wealth in the United States. No wonder Europe is poor. You see in this fact the power which is behind European emigration. Can you blame the French Socialists—for Socialists think in economic terms—for saying—that there are “two plagues to fight—drink and patriotism?”

Happily economy, conservation and efficiency are the watchwords of our day. We are coming to see that waste is immoral. Yes, more. We are coming to see that even non-productive spending is immoral. This is distinctly the winning of a new foothold for civilization. But this once won, we shall never go back to our old toleration of waste. Indeed bread hunger will not allow us to do this. We must and shall move ahead, not back. Even a Russian czar, who aspires to absolutism and military preëminence, sees that economic ruin confronts every militaristic power in the world and calls Hague conferences to discover methods to avert said ruin. Either disarmament or bankruptcy—which? The impoverishment of the people for the maintenance of rival fleets and armies is a game which is about played out. The flim flam arguments of the steel trust, of professional military and naval men, the pathetic sophistries of Army and Navy leagues, are well understood by sound economists, organized labor and international Socialism. Gunism can not stand before a swiftly evolving economic science and an ever acuter economic need. Pacifators may well rejoice. History is being pushed irresistibly in their direction. Optimistic fatalism is our privilege. The chief concern of the world family is to get something to eat. In order that the world family may eat, war must get out of the way. And the increasing habit of thinking in economic terms, so characteristic of our socialized civilization,

is prophetic of the speedy elimination of the war factor from the world problem of human life.

5. Another significant symptom is the noticeable strengthening of the judicial habit. You can measure civilization of any nation in any century by studying its method of administering justice. The tendency is all away from fist-law, the law of the jungle, and towards a better and better judicial process. It wearies the mind to attempt to conceive of the intervening chapters between the jungle chapter in man's history and trial by jury. It pains the heart to think of the earlier blind, crude, cruel attempts to organize justice.

Tacitus pictures for us the Germanic tribes in their native forests. Perhaps dearest of all rights, among those self-reliant people who carried independence to the extreme, was the right of private vengeance. Society, you see, had not risen above jungleism. Fist-law, self-redress by personal violence, prevailed.

In Saxon-England, two methods of administering justice prevailed, namely, the ordeal and compurgation. Consider the ordeal. If a man was accused of a crime he was brought to the church where the priest prayed over him and sprinkled him with holy water. A piece of iron heated red hot was then placed in his hand and he was forced to carry this red hot iron a distance of nine feet. His hand was then bound up. In three days the bandages were unwound and if the hand was blistered and sore he was adjudged guilty. Other methods of ordeal existed, such as by boiling water or by being thrown into cold water. This was the judicial method of the times—crude, bungling, cruel, but the best that the people of those days could invent.

Compurgation, or wager of law, for a long time, was a part of continental and English jurisprudence. If a charge was brought against a person, he summoned his friends and companions to join in an oath of general denial. Notice, the compurgators did not take oath as to facts, but were fellow-sharers in denying that the defendant would do such a criminal act as he was charged with, and they joined in expressing confidence in the veracity of their principal. Compurgation

was the recognized judicial procedure in the city of Lille until the middle of the fourteenth century.

Unfortunately, away back in those bad times, some men could be found who were willing to swear falsely. Hence an old Burgundian king, on discovering such instances of perjury, cried out, "Let the rascals prove it on their bodies," and he ordained trial by combat, or wager of battle, as the prescribed judicial procedure. William the Conqueror introduced the wager of battle into England and established it as the legal method of trial. Please bear in mind that we are here speaking not of private vengeance, or of the gentleman's duel, or the German student's duel, but of recognized court procedure. In case an accused person did not wish to fight in person, he or she could, if possessing sufficient means, hire a professional champion or "pugil" to fight. Hence there grew up a class of professional "pugils," some of whom attained great fame and were able to command almost any salary—perhaps one-tenth as much as a baseball player in our day receives. Thus money talked in law courts in those days as it has been whispered it has affected decisions in later times. Sometimes women fought, especially in breach of promise cases. Although wager of battle fell into disuse, it actually remained upon the statute books of England until abolished in 1819. As to its shortcomings as a method of judicial procedure one need only consult the cases recorded in which the guilty party, though victorious in combat, later made full confession of guilt. As a judicial process it left much to be desired.

Examination by torture was another method of judicial procedure. It is so horrible, and its record is so stained with bloody miscarriages of justice, that we hastily pass it by with the single suggestion that if one is spoiling for "thrillers" and the daily grist of bandit activities, murders, etc., no longer suffices to produce a "thrill," let him spend his summer in studying the history of examination by torture and he will have "thrills" galore.

From fist-law, up through co-operative lying, ordeals by fire and water, combat and torture, has man come, determined to vindicate and organize justice. Often in this attempt the

most horrible cruelties and injustices have been inflicted. But humanity presses on. How far along are we? The best thing devised thus far for the administration of law is the jury system. In a public address, quoting a great Englishman, I once made the familiar statement that government exists for the purpose of getting twelve men into a jury box, and that trial by jury is the finest product of civilization thus far. A waggish lawyer in the audience, in a loud stage whisper, exclaimed, "God help us if that's the best we can do!" You see he knew the ins and outs of the lawyer game. Nevertheless, with all its imperfections, with all the dangers impending from shyster lawyers and purchasable jurymen, not to mention corporation-made judges, the jury system is an infinite improvement over fist-law, ordeal and torture. It is cheaper, more intelligently and morally discriminating, juster and more satisfactory in every way than any kind of appeal to physical force.

While we have so long been familiar with the jury system in municipal law that it is platitudinous, so that we cease to enthuse over its excellences, strange to say it is only recently that any systematic effort has been made to apply it in international controversies. I do not mean to say that the peaceful settlement of international disputes is a novelty. There were many instances of international arbitration in the Middle Ages. And Dr. Darby tabulates over 600 cases of pacific settlement of international disputes since the Jay Treaty of 1794. But no earnest, intelligent, world-wide, effective effort was ever made to organize a high court of nations until the Hague conferences came into being. The decisions rendered by the Hague Court have been eminently satisfactory and the litigant powers cheerfully have accepted the awards. To be sure, the present Hague Court is only a panel of judges; but a real court, with permanent judges, is sure to be forthcoming in the near future. The machinery is here and is in operation. It only needs perfecting.

Every one who has followed the activities of the Hague Court will readily and heartily agree with me that such a settlement of the North Atlantic Fisheries Question is so much

cheaper, more intellectually and morally discriminating, and more satisfactory in every way than any resort to arms possibly could be, that henceforth no civilized nation will be able honorably to appeal to the arbitrament of war without first having submitted its grievance to The Hague. The signatory powers recognize this, and the "just dictates of reason" (to quote Hugo Grotius), or a "decent respect for the" enlightened opinion of the world, already casts discredit upon war, and points in the direction of judicial redress. And this habit will grow stronger each year, until war can no longer be spoken of as a "final tribunal." Law is displacing war. Camps give place to courts. Cannon are set aside by codes. Civilization, to be civilization, must be judicial, or at least must be judicial until that time when injustices, the cause of controversies, shall cease to be. And to this task of perfecting a permanent court of judicial procedure are the living jurists and publicists addressing themselves just now.

6. I shall have time to call attention to but one more set of data, namely, the international enterprises now in actual operation. In Brussels there is a Central Office of International Associations, which publishes a monthly review. In the first number of this bulletin it was stated that there are now more than 400 international organizations of various kinds. Furthermore, since 1840, over 2100 international congresses have been held. And the noteworthy fact about these is that nearly half of them have been held during the last decade, showing a rapidly accelerating trend toward international coöperation and organization. Educators, scientists, reformers, religionists, labor leaders, Socialists, business men and philanthropists, are doing effective team work together in international harness.

The Interparliamentary Union, an international organization composed of members of the various national legislatures of the world, and formed for the promotion of arbitration and better relations between nations, now numbers over 3000 in its membership. It supports a permanent bureau at Brussels. Many of the governments make annual appropriations for this bureau. While, strictly speaking, the Interparliamentary

Union is a voluntary organization, nevertheless, being composed solely of the law makers of the different nations, needless to say that such an organization, with such aims and personnel, is significant, far-reaching in influence, and highly prophetic.

But even more important than the voluntary organizations and perhaps than the Interparliamentary Union, are the strictly official, intergovernmental enterprises which have grown up and are in actual operation. I am not alluding to the scores of international conferences and congresses held jointly by national powers since the Congress of Panama in 1826. Said congresses and conferences have been assembled for the consideration of almost every kind of international question. But I have in mind especially the permanent international public unions like the Universal Postal Union, for example. These unions have not been caught down from the clouds, but have grown up from the earth, and are deeply rooted in economic needs of the people of the earth. This is the direction in which evolution is headed. It is not necessary to "change human nature" before you can make internationalism work. Cold, prosaic, economic necessity requires such international coöperation, and will require more and more of it as time goes on. Internationalism already has begun, for, even as we are talking about it, it is at work; for example, so far as the carrying of the mails is concerned, internationalism has been working for thirty-nine years. This is the direction in which evolution is headed. Assuredly man has come a long way from jungleism to Universal Postal Unions, from fist-law to Hague Courts.

In the light of such facts as we have been considering and others which might be added, what shall be our conclusion as to the possibility and probability of getting rid of war?

Let us come back again to our biological principle of canalization with which we started, namely, to the scientific law that as an organism goes on evolving and as it specializes in any particular function it cuts for itself a path or channel which keeps getting deeper and deeper, until at last this channel determines the direction of onward movement; so

that, if you can discover the direction in which it has been moving, you can know in what direction it will move, yes, must move, henceforth, if it is to continue to exist. Having gone a certain distance in a certain direction it can not begin over under its original conditions.

This law applied infallibly to parasites. Prof. Kellogg tells us of a certain unmentionable parasite which he has been investigating for years. This creature started with ears, eyes, wings and all the capacities for a complex, refined existence. Finding that it could live without work by living on other beings, it became a lazy parasite. There being no further necessity for ears, eyes and wings, these disappeared. The parasite became practically just a coarse stomach of a very degenerate type, able to live on dirt, old hair, etc. Please note, having specialized thus far as a parasite, this being can not go back and begin over again and, starting with a fresh pair of wings, avoid the mistake of parasitism. It is doomed forever to continue as a parasite or drop out of existence completely, as so many forms of life already have done. This is not guess work—mere idle guessing—it is well-grounded science which enables us thus to predict the future of this particular parasite.

But does the law of canalization hold true of beings other than parasites? Personally I believe that canalization (or something like it which some other name might describe better) holds as true of beings on the up-grade as of those that are going down. Take man himself. As I read history I am convinced that man is specializing in two things as the centuries slip by, namely, in rational thinking and in moral goodness. These two facts differentiate man from all other animate beings. In rational thinking man has come a long distance—all the way from mere animal instinct of the jungle-man to modern science, with its multiplication table, its microscopes and telescopes, its steamships and railroads. Would the human race willingly give up these things and go back to jungleism? It is unthinkable. On the contrary the human mind is bent on conquering new realms of knowledge.

So, too, with man's ethical development. Here and there selfish or morally-lazy individuals might be willing to revert to the ethics of the jungle, but the race, as a race, is pressing upward, growing more humane, becoming more and more insistent on organized justice. Can you think of the race being willing to go back even so short a distance as to chattel slavery or to the factory conditions which existed in England before the passage of the Reform Bill? If you can conceive of such a thing, then all I can say is that you do not know the human family very well, nor do you read the lessons of history aright, for history shows that the race is coming up and going onward. Here and there some low-typed savage (there are such even in civilized lands) might be willing to go back to the days when physical force had no bounds set to it, and when cruelties were absolutely unconfined. But the heart of the race seems to be set on organizing safeguards against such things. The trend is upward, not downward.

Now see how this applies to the problem of war. Man has come a long distance in a certain direction. In his primal jungle he was just "an animal among animals," a red-handed and red-fanged killer, an eater even of his fellow-man. Today you would have to go to some such primeval jungle as the heart of Africa to see human beings pursuing their human quarry, as black warriors pursued Stanley's party on the Congo with cries of "Meat! Meat!" But civilized peoples demand a less uncertain and different kind of food supply. We have come so far that we shall not turn back to cannibalism and jungle life. Never again will the world tolerate Seven Years' Wars, Thirty Years' Wars and Hundred Years' Wars. Never again will war be the normal state of society and peace the exception. Never again will the chief business of men be war. Never again will the world allow private war. Never again will war be waged without rules governing war practices. Not much longer will the growing conscience of man tolerate the economic waste of war or rival armed peace. Never again will judicial procedure revert to ordeals and combat and fist-law. Never again will we do even to pirates what our Saxon forefathers used to do to captured Norsemen—flay them alive

and nail their hides to church doors, as we know from the bits of human skin found under the broadheaded nails now in the British museum. Never again will we cut warm slices out of the still quivering body of a newly-slain foe as Uncas did to Miantonomo when the latter was sent back by a Boston council of ministers to Connecticut to be killed. Never again will we stick the severed head of our war-victim on our public buildings as the Pilgrims of Plymouth for twenty years exposed the grinning skull of King Philip on their fort, therein only doing what all European nations did in those days. Never again will "civilized" peoples go to war every twenty days to provide the necessary human sacrifices for the gods, as did the ancient Mexicans; the modern world hasn't much use for deities with such appetites, or for any deity that is blood-hungry. Man has gone on so far in science in humanness, in ethics, in religion, in industrial teamwork, that any suggestion looking to the giving up of these things would evoke amusement, or impatience, or pity, or medical treatment. Never will the race give up its world-embracing mail system and the other half hundred international public unions. Never again, because of inexorable economic necessity, can a nation live unto itself.

In a word, the biological principle of canalization convinces scientific minds that social evolution is headed towards a warless society. The trend is unmistakable. Direction and distance are scientifically prophetic. If the race is to get ahead, war must get out of the way—out of the way of industry and business and bread-producing, out of the way of economic need, out of the way of an already potent social conscience, out of the way of education and sanitation and conservation. Either war must be eliminated or civilization must perish. The race having come all the way from cave-dwelling to flat-dwelling, in all probability will not stop now. It will go on to new and higher attainments, to new and better economic and social conditions, to new and more rational judicial procedure, to new and worthier forms of struggle. Strife will be transformed from brutal blood-spilling to scientific and moral warfare. We have gone so far in rational thinking and

in moral goodness, and we like these things so well, that we shall not, we will not, we can not, turn back.

And so we may emphasize the familiar Hebrew prophecy just as brave, prophetic William Ladd used to emphasize it—"The sword shall be beaten into plowshares, the spear shall be beaten into pruning hooks." In our day, not only can the pacificators see this by moral faith, but the biologist, the anthropologist, the sociologist can see it with the eye of science.

Up in Portage, Wisconsin, is a house on the very watershed between the Fox and Wisconsin rivers. If a drop of rain runs down one side of the ridgepole, it trickles down the shingles and in time finds its way into the Gulf of St. Lawrence. If it runs down the other side of the roof it brings up in the Gulf of Mexico. Having once started down the one side or the other it can not retrace its course, and start afresh. Direction and distance traveled determine destination. Therefore I am just optimistic fatalist and fatalistic optimist enough to believe that man has canalized for himself a course which is carrying him inevitably and more and more completely away from war. Direction and distance traveled enable the modern scientific mind to perceive that man is headed away from jungleism towards a completer and completer internationalism. Only by an unforeseen and catastrophic and utter extinction of the human species, can man escape his inevitable and rapidly approaching terrestrial destiny of organized pacificism and world-wide coöperation. We have left the jungle far behind and are fast nearing the goal of internationalism, which goal, once attained, will be the beginning-point of real civilization.

Canada's Message

FROM THE PRIME MINISTER.

Ottawa, Ont., April 2, 1913.

My Dear Sir:

In reply to your letter of 10th March I beg to say that the Government of Canada have profound sympathy with the objects of the Fourth American Peace Congress, which is to be held in St. Louis early in May of this year under the auspices of The Business Men's League of St. Louis, the Missouri Peace Society and the American Peace Society.

Would you be good enough to convey to the Executive Committee my sincere thanks for their courtesy in inviting me to attend the Congress and to deliver an address upon some phase of Internationalism.

My public duties in connection with the session of Parliament which is now in progress, and which will probably be continued during the whole of May, prevent my accepting the invitation. I send, however, my best wishes that the Congress may be successful in every way. The people and Government of Canada are animated with a very sincere and earnest desire to preserve and maintain the most cordial and friendly relations with our neighbors of the great Republic. On their behalf I send a message of good will and friendship to the people of the United States as represented in the Fourth American Peace Congress.

Faithfully yours,

R. L. BORDEN.

James E. Smith, Esq.,
Fourth American Peace Congress,
St. Louis, Mo.

Greetings from Guatemala

L. D. KINGSLAND, Consul General.

As the accredited delegate representing the Republic of Guatemala, it gives me special pleasure to bring greetings from its beloved President, Señor Don Cabrera, who has for so many years presided over the destinies of that Republic, with one thought for its people—peace and prosperity. In the many political controversies developed in Latin-America, he has always been a beacon light for conservatism and the guiding hand to counsel and direct peace to and for all neighboring Republics. Guatemala is reaching out in every legitimate way to extend the hand of friendship and peace to all the nations of the earth. It has set an example to the many countries of Latin-America by demonstrating that peace means prosperity, safety and happiness to all citizens under its protecting flag, and it welcomes strangers with the assurance of protection while within its confines. No country is more blest with climate, soils, agriculture, timber and mining interests than Guatemala. All these industries have gone forward with success through the munificent laws of protection to those who seek its shores, thus demonstrating that peace brings happiness and reward to those who believe in the brotherhood of mankind. Whatever action this Congress takes looking to universal peace, Guatemala will be found in the front rank of its advocates and will always be found a sincere friend to those fighting for the relief and independence of mankind.

THE UNIVERSITIES AND THE PEACE MOVEMENT

Thursday Afternoon, May 1, at 2 o'clock

SHELDON MEMORIAL AUDITORIUM.

DR. ISIDOR LOEB, Presiding

The opening address at the section meeting to consider the relations of "The Universities and the Peace Movement" was given by Louis P. Lochner, general secretary of the Association of Cosmopolitan Clubs. Mr. Lochner's subject was, "Internationalism Among Universities."

Internationalism Among Universities

LOUIS P. LOCHNER.

Scholarship in its very nature is international. The scientist, the linguist, the technician, the historian, the man of letters—each is dependent upon international co-operation for the achievement of the highest results in his particular field of endeavor. An American Peary can discover the North Pole because of the accumulated knowledge that the scientific explorations of an Irish Dicuil, a Danish Bering, an English Hudson, a Norwegian Nansen, have made international property. The American archæologist Platner can publish his "Topography and Monuments of Ancient Rome" because the researches of a German Hulsén, an Italian Lanciani, an English Ashby have preceded his own. Colonel Goethals accomplishes the stupendous engineering feat of digging the Panama Canal by utilizing the services as well as avoiding the mistakes of his French and British predecessors. The German Zeppelin astounds the world with a dirigible balloon made possible through previous, though imperfect, conquests of the air by such men of science as Lussac of France, and Green and Coxwell of England. In short, it may truly be

said of the scholar, that "every factor in his culture, every science which he knows, has been built up by the cumulative services of men in every nation in the successive ages."

It is not surprising, then, that we find an ever-increasing tendency among men of science and of letters to recognize this mutual interdependence by organizing and federating internationally and, having perfected such welding together along lines of common interest, to co-operate henceforth upon a world scale. Even the most sanguine of workers for international co-operation must have been pleasantly surprised when, a little over a year ago, the Foundation for Internationalism at The Hague in a singularly interesting volume on "Scientific Internationalism—Pure Sciences and Letters" acquainted us with the names, officers, forms of organization and brief historical sketch of six hundred and fourteen international organizations and institutions in the scholastic world, all of them embracing at least a pair of nations, many holding periodic world congresses, and not a few maintaining an official organ of their own. These organizations and institutions embrace every field of scholastic endeavor—from literature to geodesy, from theology to scientific photography, from history to technology.

This growing spirit of internationalism among men of learning is further advanced and accentuated by the system of interchange of scholars which is proving its lasting merit the longer it is in vogue. The Theodore Roosevelt-Kaiser Wilhelm and the Harvard-Berlin exchange professorships, bringing as they do to this country representatives of the best thought of Germany, and cementing anew the cultural bonds between ourselves and the great German nation, so immediately and completely justified their existence that similar exchange arrangements with French, Scandinavian, Japanese and South American scholars have been completed in rapid succession. Who can estimate the value of bringing the faculties and student bodies of the countries concerned into personal contact with these ambassadors of intellect of a sister nation?

Parallel with this exchange professorship idea have been evolved various schemes for enabling picked students to

receive part of their collegiate training in a foreign country. Naturally we think first of the Cecil Rhodes Scholarships which provide a stipend by means of which young men from the United States, Germany and the British Colonies can spend three years as students in historic old Oxford. The eagerness with which the young scholars thus far selected have embraced the opportunity of spending the long vacation terms on the European continent or in other portions of the British Isles, and thus further widening their horizon, in itself bears testimony to the broadening influence that their training at a foreign seat of learning exercised upon them. And the rapidity with which the great majority of former Rhodes scholars have risen to positions of trust and influence is proof positive of the value of broad international training.

Somewhat different in scope and, I believe, more broadening in their influence than even the Rhodes Scholarships, are the Traveling Fellowships for Teachers made possible through the generosity of M. Albert Kahn, of Paris. These are offered, approximately two a year for each country included, to scholars in France, Germany, the United States, Japan and England who are fully matured, but at the same time still young and alert enough not to have fallen into set grooves. The beneficiaries of the Kahn Foundation pledge themselves in the course of their incumbency of a traveling fellowship to visit the leading countries of the Orient and of Europe, and by personal observation and contact to learn how other peoples and races are living and are solving their problems.

This same idea of education by travel underlies the scholarships offered by the Association for the International Interchange of Students between North America and the United Kingdom, whose central bureau is at London. This Association during its first experimental period (1909-12) arranged for introductions to influential persons, mapped out study tours, and planned the work on such tours—all for the beneficiaries of the scholarships. The young men who from time to time were sent to us from England worked on our farms, lived on the east side of New York, inspected some of our universities, interviewed both capitalist and laborer, sojourned in metropolis and countryside, viewed our wonders

of nature, and beheld our stupendous industrial plants. Similar experiences fell to the lot of our students sent to Great Britain. One needs but to read the accounts of these young men—and women, too, for similar tours were arranged for female students—to grasp something of the significance of the movement. The beneficiaries of these scholarships returned to their respective countries as so many apostles of internationalism, each determined to do his best to promote harmonious relations between the peoples of the earth. It was a condition of these scholarships that each recipient return for at least a year to his university, so that his broadening influence might be felt among his fellow students. Thus these scholars entered upon a career of singular usefulness immediately after rounding out the terms of their scholarship.

No more fitting tribute to the importance of international training could have been paid by our Chinese sister republic than her decision to use the portion of the Boxer Indemnity remitted by our government for sending to this country annually some four to six hundred competitively elected students. These splendid young celestials, with many of whom it has been and is my good fortune to be linked in the most intimate bonds of friendship, are not only eliciting from the communities in which they matriculate a tardy recognition of the fact that the "foreign devil" is a man with as much all-around ability, intellectual capacity, lofty idealism, and power of accomplishment as the so-called "superior white," but are proving themselves the men of the hour at this important period of China's imperative need for leadership of the very highest order. Why, three of the closest friends of my undergraduate days were Chinese students. The first is now assistant director of the gigantic railway system of China; the second a professor of political science in a Chinese provincial college; the third a press correspondent at Shanghai for eight leading American newspapers and for the Reuter International News Agency!

This migration of Chinese scholars to a foreign country for purposes of study is typical of a tendency which is of tremendous portent for the future of amicable international relations: I mean the tendency not to limit one's education

to attendance at a native university, but to complete and augment it by study abroad. Berlin, Leipsic, Paris, Oxford, Cambridge, Vienna, Madrid, Columbia, Pennsylvania and Cornell Universities—I could name a score of others—have become so many melting pots of nations because of the international composition of their student bodies.

As these students from many lands became transfused with the spirit of internationalism pervading their universities, they began to organize and thereby to make possible one of the greatest modern factors for peace—The International Federation of Students. Let me briefly sketch the history of this movement.

As early as 1898, a fiery young Italian of Turin addressed an appeal to the students of the world. "Let us fraternize," he said, "let us fraternize and unite in one vast, gigantic federation"—and he then proceeded to expound his plans for a world-wide federation of students. The student associations of Europe, especially of Southern Europe, responded generously to the invitation of their Italian confreres to meet in an international convention, and at Rome from the historic Forum Romanum was proclaimed the "*Fédération Internationale des Etudiants*," which bears as its motto the two Italian words "*Corda Fratres*" (Brothers in Heart), and which has for its principal aim that of "favoring and protecting the idea of fraternity and solidarity among students."

In spite of numerous vicissitudes, such as any new organization is likely to encounter, the Federation held its own, even founding branches in Argentina, Paraguay and New York City; until a year ago last September, when the members met in their Seventh International Congress, a new element was introduced which gave a tremendous impetus to the movement and put it on a world-wide scale. This element was the presence of delegations from the Cosmopolitan and International Clubs of North America and Germany and of the "*Liga de los Estudiantes*" of South America, and the consequent affiliation of the bodies which they represented with the *Corda Fratres* movement.

Briefly, the facts with reference to the Cosmopolitan Clubs are as follows: Since 1903 there have gradually sprung

up in some thirty universities, colleges and technical schools of this country, cosmopolitan or international clubs made up of the foreign-born and a limited number of native students. The purpose of these organizations is to bring together into one brotherhood men from different countries, to learn the customs, viewpoints and characteristics of other nationalities, to remove racial prejudices, and to establish international friendships. Since 1907 these clubs have allied themselves in a national Association of Cosmopolitan Clubs. A monthly magazine, *The Cosmopolitan Student*, keeps the members in touch with each other and with the work confronting the federated body. Annual conventions afford picked representatives from the local units an opportunity to deliberate upon problems common to all the clubs, and to listen to inspiring addresses by speakers of international fame.

The value of organized effort is seen from the facts that the Association has prevailed upon a score of universities to appoint special faculty advisers for foreign students; that it has received the virtual promise of the U. S. Commissioner of Education to issue a bulletin of information regarding American universities for the guidance of foreigners contemplating matriculation in our higher institutions of learning; that it has effected an exchange of membership privileges between the component chapters by means of which the individual member migrating to another university is at once made to feel at home; and that it is now attempting to persuade the faculties at large universities to offer special courses in spoken English to foreigners. It is significant that these measures owe their origin for the most part to the United States members. On the other hand the foreign students in these clubs have been largely responsible for the raising of \$2,500.00 to help relieve the Chinese famine sufferers in 1910, for the numerous appreciative articles that have appeared in foreign journals about American life and institutions, for the project now under consideration of holding a world's students' congress on the Pacific coast in 1915, and for the splendid missionary work of acquainting their fellow students and the college communities in which they live with foreign civilizations through the medium of periodic "national nights," in

the course of which the representatives of one nation describe the customs and institutions of their mother country, play the music of their native composers and on their native instruments, recite and interpret masterpieces of their literature, exhibit their national dances, serve their characteristic dishes—in short, transmit the spirit of their country to the audience.

Alumni of our clubs, among them especially Dr. Geo. W. Nasmyth, of Cornell University, have planted the germs of cosmopolitanism in the midst of the German universities, and have been instrumental in founding "Internationale Studentenvereine" successively at Berlin, Leipsic, Munich, Goettingen and Heidelberg, and in leaguizing the German branches into a "Verband" similar to the North American Association. The officers of this "Verband" are in cordial relation with their confreres on this side of the Atlantic. A member of our Association is also responsible for the organization of the Cosmopolitan Club of Roberts College, Constantinople.

In 1909, at the invitation of the Central Bureau of the "Fédération Internationale des Etudiants Corda Fratres," members of the Association of Cosmopolitan Clubs took part in the Sixth International Congress of that body at The Hague, Holland. They were so impressed with the similarity in aims and ideals between the "Fédération Internationale" and the Cosmopolitan Association that they strongly recommended the affiliation of these two large student bodies—a recommendation which, however, was not put into complete effect until after the Congress at Rome in 1911, at which time the German International Clubs were also represented by a delegate.

The League of South American Students has had a similar record of genuine usefulness. In 1908 the students of South and North America were invited to a Pan-American congress at Montevideo, Uruguay. That congress, at which students from the United States unfortunately did not take part, provided for the organization of a League of American Students, for the biennial holding of international congresses and for the founding of a central bureau at Montevideo.

The "Liga" now embraces the student bodies of practically all the republics of South and Central America and of Mexico. The congress of Montevideo has been followed by one at Buenos Ayres, Argentina, in 1910, and at Lima, Peru, in 1912. At the latter gathering ten universities of North America were also represented by personal delegates.

As one glances through the voluminous proceedings of these congresses, one can not but note the similarity in aims and purposes of the "Liga" with the aims and objects of the Corda Fratres of Europe and the Cosmopolitan Clubs of North America, even though the organization is a less formal one. The spirit of internationalism breathes forth from every page.

At the Corda Fratres congress at Rome in 1911, then, we find these three forces represented: the consulates or chapters of Corda Fratres, the Cosmopolitan and International Clubs of North America and Germany, and the League of Students of South America. It was no small thing to mould these three movements—each presenting a somewhat different plan of organization, each proud of its history and results—into a component whole; and to provide a form of international organization so flexible as to enable other movements which might exist in other countries, such as the East and West Clubs of England, to become affiliated. But good-will and mutual concession wrought the seeming miracle, and for almost two years we have been working under a tentative and experimental platform of world confederation, the principal features of which are, first, the neutrality of the Federation in matters affecting religious, political or economic principles; second, the complete autonomy of the component groups; third, the composition of an international central committee of direction, consisting of two members from each country represented; fourth, the provision for regular biennial congresses; and fifth, the stress laid upon the extension of hospitality, upon correspondence between members of different countries, and upon the encouragement of mutual understanding as a means of promoting amicable international relations.

Thus we have gone a great way toward uniting the students in an all-embracing world federation. We of the American group are especially happy that the Eighth International Congress, to be held four months hence, has been awarded to the United States, and that the Cosmopolitan Club of Cornell University, the strongest branch in our Association, is to act as host during the official sessions.

The preparations for the congress are now well under way. Invitations to the students of the world have been sent for circulation to all the foreign ministries, to all the student college papers of this and other countries, to all the student associations whose names could be learned by the Congress Committee headed by Carlos L. Locsin, of Cornell, a Filipino student of remarkable organizing powers, and to hundreds of individual students. An honorary committee headed by President Wilson, and comprising such names as those of U. S. Commissioner of Education Philander P. Claxton, Director General John Barrett of the Pan-American Union, Secretary Benjamin F. Trueblood of the American Peace Society, Governor Sulzer and Mayor Gaynor of New York, Edwin Ginn of Boston, Director Edwin D. Mead of the World Peace Foundation, Editor Hamilton Holt of *The Independent*, Dr. Andrew D. White, and the presidents of practically all colleges and universities at which there are cosmopolitan clubs, is giving its moral support to the congress. The Division for Intercourse and Education of the Carnegie Foundation has shown its interest by granting a considerable subvention to help finance the congress, while the World Peace Foundation of Boston has made it possible for President Nasmyth of the International Central Committee to spend most of his term of office in Europe, where he is rousing the student bodies of the Old World to the importance of the coming international meeting.

Though the official sessions are to be held at Ithaca, it is planned to take the foreign visitors to a number of places of interest, including New York City, Albany, Schenectady, Niagara Falls, Buffalo, Philadelphia, Washington, Boston and Cambridge.

I sincerely hope that the universities of this country will appoint delegates to this congress and thereby embrace the splendid opportunity offered of encouraging the cause of international good-will and humanity. Never before has an opportunity like this come to the students of this country to show their international-mindedness. Will they rise to the occasion?

The International Federation of Students is not a peace society, technically so-called. We can in the very nature of things not endorse any particular mode of settlement of international disputes. Nevertheless, our movement is pregnant with tremendous possibilities for peace. For, we bring together at the most formative period of their lives, picked young men from many different countries—men fore-ordained to become leaders of thought and action in their respective countries—and show them that “the other fellow” is animated by the same high ideals for which they take credit, acquaint them with other peoples and civilizations, and teach them that humanity—all-embracing, all-including, linked with the idea of brotherly love, of sympathetic understanding, of good-will toward all mankind—is a bond of union transcending national, racial, or color lines of demarcation.

In conclusion, I desire to advance a positive suggestion for further advancing the spirit of internationalism in the scholastic world. It is this: Should not the coming world congress of students be utilized for calling into life an International Institute of Universities, which shall act as a clearing house, as a central repository for information affecting the entire scholastic world? I have in mind a bureau which shall be instrumental in promoting international congresses of scholars and students, in organizing international visits between students and professors of different countries, in publishing an international students' magazine. I have in mind a bureau which shall collect and distribute data concerning the requirements for admission and degrees, fees and cost of living, special advantages offered in various fields by different universities, and all other subjects of interest to students contemplating matriculation abroad. I have in mind a bureau which shall act as the press agent for distinguished scholars

who visit other countries on lecture tours, and which shall co-operate in arranging for the itinerary of these lecturers. Limitations of space forbid a detailed discussion of the many uses to which such an institute could be put. Suffice it to say that it would serve, as nothing yet devised, to unite and unify the numerous forces now at work in the scholastic world for hastening the day of complete world organization.

The machinery is provided in the organizations which I have sketched—who will furnish the motive power?

Mrs. Fannie Fern Andrews, Secretary of the American School Peace League, followed Mr. Lochner. Her subject was "The Progress of the Peace Movement Through Education."

Progress of the Peace Movement Through Education

MRS. FANNIE FERN ANDREWS.

The peace movement today is a psychological contradiction. We find, on the one hand, a hopeful outlook for the political organization of the world. Everybody agrees that at this stage of civilization international conflicts should go to an international court, clothed with full power to administer justice. All the great nations of the earth have declared in favor of this reasonable procedure. On the other hand, the most ardent advocate of the peace movement is amazed, if not terrified, by the striking phenomena of the past year. Expenditures for naval armaments never before reached such prodigious amounts. The world has become abnormal—almost to the breaking point. With the encouraging and assuring progress toward world organization, standing in contrast with this counter reactionary spectacle of threatened bankruptcy, the friends of peace find themselves confronted with a problem without precedent in the history of the movement.

The crucial character of the situation forces a solution. The most casual thinker knows that what the public opinion of the world demands of nations, it will get. If public

opinion is determined to build up a world organization which will render recourse to war among nations unnecessary, this will proceed apace. If, too, public opinion demands amelioration from the present bankrupting policy of the nations, the world will be delivered from the nightmare which now throttles it and prohibits the use of its resources for the necessary and pressing needs of humanity.

To convince the public opinion of the world, and to convert it into an active compelling force is the present task of the worker for international peace. He at once becomes a psychologist and a scientist. He must perceive, more clearly than ever before, that if he is to get the co-operation of public opinion in the movement for world organization, he must be able to interpret clearly and logically the political and economic advantages following upon the organization of the world into a group of mutually helpful nations. This process is education, and it involves scientific research into a subject hitherto almost ignored. This research must involve a study of the rules which should regulate the relations of nations in their common intercourse. These constitute the law of nations, a knowledge of which is necessary for a sound public opinion. Education, therefore, in this direction is a potent factor in the peace movement. Moreover, the results of such research are a distinct contribution to human knowledge, and offer an opportunity for creating, as never before, a rational interpretation of public law.

Education is the sole relief for the armament craze. Public opinion can never be influential unless it is substantiated by facts. It must understand the relation of the stupendous expenditures for military operations and the international well-being and world-wide aspirations for economic and social advancement. The results of economic research will point out the method of attacking this situation. They lead inevitably to a study of the limitation of armaments, and a consequent interrogation as to the real reason for the huge expenditures. Such knowledge is invaluable in the present crisis and helps to answer the basic questions—Why do the nations arm, and who gain by such preparations for war?

The Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, through its Divisions of International Law and Economics and History, the World Peace Foundation, the International Conciliation Association, and the International Law Association, through their researches and publications, are contributing to the peace movement a fundamental basis for developing a sound public opinion. To make this dynamic, determined to push forward the practical program for world organization, and simultaneously to force a solution of the destructive armament situation, is the work of the pacifists today. Every organization in the world carrying on peace propaganda should take up its work with a greater concentration than ever before. The future program consists not so much of new methods as of increased determination. This propaganda is avowedly educational, and if we should analyze it, we should find that its functions are: (1) to disseminate among the whole people the information gained by the scientists; (2) to initiate measures for promoting a more intimate acquaintance among peoples, and (3) to develop scientifically and systematically the spirit of good-will and an appreciation of justice.

The Division of Intercourse and Education of the Carnegie Endowment combines these three lines of propaganda in its stated function, which, in the words of the Endowment itself, is to "make practical application of the teaching and findings of the Divisions of International Law and Economics and History." This is a powerful agency for instructing the public opinion of the world. The great network of peace societies, focused in the International Bureau at Berne, constitute in themselves a body of opinion, strong in influence and extensive in scope. More and more the governments are recognizing the weight of their contentions.

The forces making for a better acquaintance among the peoples of the earth are innumerable. The mingling of peoples in the interchanges of commerce, travel, science, invention, art and education has brought about a world community spirit, transcending national boundaries and culminating in the well-being of the world at large. Every extension of this natural interchange is an added force for

world peace. The extent to which the people of the earth have become acquainted is strikingly set forth in the Central Bureau of International Institutions at Brussels. Standing in this great library of over eleven million cards, cataloguing information of almost every activity of the human race, one feels himself surrounded by the world's achievements, focused in one common purpose—the development of a higher and nobler civilization. *La Vie Internationale*, a book of nearly 1500 pages, issued annually under the auspices of this Bureau, illustrates with striking significance the force of composite effort. It records nearly five hundred international organizations, two hundred of which meet every year. To realize the significance of this remarkably extensive interchange of thought, is to believe in the family of nations. It was to develop a consciousness of all this and to establish a clearing-house of information for all those who are studying the world activities that Senator Henri La Fontaine, President of the International Peace Bureau, began these laborious compilations. The world owes a lasting debt to this man who, through his painstaking efforts and genuine self-sacrifice, has organized international expression for the education of the whole world.

All this develops friendly feelings and a genuine respect for the opinions of different peoples. The way is clear today, however, for a simultaneous effort, direct and concentrated, to promote the spirit of good-will and an appreciation of justice. We need what has been called, on more than one occasion, an international mind. To obtain this, the colleges and schools can come to our assistance.

Education has always been guided by the underlying thoughts of a period, and the type of thinking, characteristic of modern education at its best, coincides in spirit with the movement to promote peace among the nations. This fact is borne out by the ready response given by the colleges to the Cosmopolitan Club idea which has developed into such a mighty power for international fraternity. The syllabus of lectures on International Conciliation, given at Stanford University by President David Starr Jordan and Professor Edward B. Krehbiel, issued by the World Peace Foundation,

is another striking response from the college to the peace idea of the present time. In this syllabus of thirty-seven lectures the authors discuss the history of warfare, the evils of war, the historical background of the present peace movement, the beginnings of a world legislature, the beginnings of a world judiciary, the conditions tending to promote international amity, and the means of promoting peace. This syllabus is proving invaluable to the professors in other universities and colleges where similar instruction is rapidly being organized. Nowhere else, perhaps, has the literature of the movement been so thoughtfully collected and so well classified. The international exchange of university professors and public school teachers is in line with the same tendency to make education coincide with the spirit of the age; while the hearty endorsement of the aims and methods of the American School Peace League by the Federal Bureau of Education, the National Education Association, the state teachers' associations, and the school systems of the country, indicates a positive willingness on the part of educators to throw the weight of their influence on the side of world peace. The American School Peace League was organized for the avowed purpose of promoting a fuller acquaintance and better understanding among the people of different nations. It aims to ingrain into the consciousness of our people the idea that the nations are co-operating equals, assisting each other in developing commerce and science and in spreading education and culture throughout the world.

This is a legitimate function of the schools, and whatever they do in this direction counts for real education. This broad and intelligent knowledge of peoples is a most desirable element in the liberal culture of a people. In its work with the elementary and secondary schools, the American School Peace League, dealing with unprejudiced minds, has the greatest opportunity of all to control public opinion. The Course in Citizenship, prepared by the League, covers the first eight grades of school. Since good-will is the fundamental principle underlying international harmony, this idea has been made the basis of the course. Good-will in little children expresses itself through kindness and helpfulness at

home and in school, and loyalty to these simple ties can spread circle by circle in the child's growth till it reaches the goal of good-will among all men. The aim is to promote action, prompted by an appreciation of the obligations of a citizen who takes his part in the development of modern civilization. As soon as a child is old enough to be conscious of ties outside his own being he begins his life as a member of society, with duties and obligations. These outside relations form the incipient beginnings of citizenship. A child is a little citizen in his own sphere, which gradually widens until he assumes the functions of a citizen in its broad sense. His first consciousness of relation to others develops in his contact with home life; his next important activity concerns himself as a member of the school; then as a member of his city and state; as a citizen of his country, and finally as a member of the larger social group, the world.

In this course the early grades are devoted to the ties of home life; the next proceed with the school and the playground; then the city and state; the nation, and the world. The course leads the pupil into the study of international rights and obligations. He is taught to appreciate other peoples and other civilizations and to understand the special mission of the United States in world progress. The committee is now collecting suitable material for each grade from history, literature, geography and civics to illustrate these lessons. Such material will be published in book form, one for each grade of school, together with the full outline for all the grades.

The History Committee is aiming to bring about a new conception of history and to encourage such teaching which shall accord with the twentieth century idea of world progress. The pupil who is taught by this method will learn of the high significance of those things which enter into a true conception of civilization. The committee is now preparing a manual on the teaching of history which will include a model course of study with detailed and explicit suggestions for the teacher.

The League does not confine its activities to this country. From the beginning its aim was to secure the interest of

teachers in all countries in the movement for international co-operation, so that the coming generations all over the world might be imbued with the spirit of good-will and an appreciation of justice.

Through the initial efforts of the League, the Dutch Government has called an International Conference on Education to meet at The Hague next September, when the teaching of history and the teaching of citizenship will occupy an important place on the program. The coming together of the representatives of the nations will result in a common knowledge of the purpose which each nation has at heart, for through the educational system of a country one can understand its ideals. It can not be doubted that a systematic effort to understand one another educationally will foster mutual respect and good-will among the nations. The International Council of Education, which we hope will be the result of this International Conference, will, therefore, be a substantial contribution to the effort to secure the peace of the world.

Education, then, is a panacea for international friction. Education will develop that public opinion to which the nations will surely respond. ✓

A SYMPOSIUM ON DISARMAMENT

THE ISSUE OF "ADEQUATE" DEFENSE

Thursday Afternoon, May 1, at 2 o'clock

THE ODEON.

PROFESSOR ROLAND G. USHER, OF WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY,
Presiding

PROFESSOR USHER:

Mr. Carnegie was to have presided at this meeting, but the very strenuous work of the morning has compelled him to rest and he is not able to be with us this afternoon. It has fallen to my lot to preside. The subject for this symposium is Disarmament. We mean what we say in the announcement. After the chair has called upon a certain number of speakers we shall invite remarks from the floor.

It gives me great pleasure to introduce to you first, Philip Van Ness Meyer, author, scholar, pacifist, for a number of years a man of repute well able to speak to us upon the question of disarmament.

The New Conscience

PHILIP VAN NESS MEYER.

The only word which I shall venture to contribute to this symposium on disarmament is a word as to the way in which the teacher can best aid this great cause.

We must note, first, that the condition precedent of the final and complete triumph of this movement is the creation of a new conscience in regard to the entire war system as an internationally recognized and legalized institution of modern civilization; for, believe me, it is the new conscience, and not the new dreadnought, that is going to abolish war and keep it abolished. Men will never stop fighting merely because fighting is costly and dangerous. History affords sufficient

evidence of this. Men will stop fighting only when they can no longer fight with a good conscience. Hence the awakening of this new conscience in the young must be the aim of the teacher who would help make real the prophetic vision of the nations dwelling together in peace and unity in a disarmed world.

Now, every science related directly or indirectly to man, interpreted with insight and breadth of view, becomes an effective means of awakening true moral feelings and judgments respecting war and the ruinous expenditures of the nations on the implements of war.

Biology has already made valuable contributions to this campaign of moral education. I need merely refer to the great biological argument against war as embodied in that notable work entitled "The Human Harvest," by President Jordan. That little book, showing how the destruction in war of the flower of the young manhood of the nations generation after generation results, through the inevitable workings of biological laws, in such a degeneracy of the human stock as imperils the very existence of modern civilization, has created in thousands new feelings and a new conscience, not merely as to the irrationality, but as to the criminality of war between civilized nations.

Likewise should the ethical element in economics be stressed. The economic argument against war should be turned into a moral argument, and its force thereby enhanced many fold. This can be done, because all economic questions are at bottom moral questions. The expenditure yearly by the nations on their competitive war armaments of sums counted by thousands of millions must be shown to be something which concerns not the economist alone, but the moralist as well. Conscience is deeply involved in this thing. An eminent worker in the peace cause has put it all in a phrase. He has said, "I should like to add an eleventh command to the Ten Commandments, and it would be this: 'Thou shalt not waste thy substance.'" This waste of communal resources on war armaments, whereby every social, intellectual, and moral interest of society suffers from lack of adequate support, is the national sin of this age.

But of all the sciences none can be made, through presentation from the moral point of view, more directly contributory to the creation of a new conscience respecting the essential wickedness of war than the science of history. This is so because of the moral content of history. History has been defined as applied psychology. We make the definition narrower and maintain that history is applied conscience. Conscience is the great history maker. The great issues of history, like this issue of disarmament, are moral issues. The great reforms and revolutions of history are moral in their deepest causes as well as in their most important and enduring effects. They result ever from a divergence between what is and what ought to be. And because this is so—because the essence of true history is the record of the moral life of man, is the story of the conflict of good and evil within the human soul and its awakening through the travail of the ages to a clearer "vision of the divine;"—because this is so, this great drama of humanity, like the drama of the stage, as conceived by the greatest of Greek philosophers, has a cleansing and clarifying effect upon the moral sense.

The limitations of time under which we speak forbid our offering any proofs or illustrations of this one thesis, that history envisioned and interpreted, not in terms of politics, as has been our wont hitherto, but in terms of ethics, in terms of the unfolding moral consciousness of man, may be made a powerful means of creating in the young a conscience uncompromisingly intolerant of war and of these insane, suicidal expenditures of the nations on all the infernal enginery of war.

I offer merely my personal confession of faith—a faith created and confirmed by the evidences of an unfolding and increasing moral purpose in the historic evolution: I believe that through an ethical necessity the day of the universal disarmament of the nations approaches; that there dawns a better age, the men of which will look with the same incredulous amazement upon our engines and devices for wholesale man-killing that we of this age look upon the Iron Virgin of Nuremberg and the other infernal mediæval instruments of torture in the museums of Europe.

In view of the wars and rumors of wars that fill the earth at this very hour; in view of the fact that preparations for war were never so vast and costly as they are today; in view of these things, does our optimistic forecast of the speedy disarmament of the nations seem to you oversanguine and incredible? If so, we are persuaded that this is because you have failed to note what is really the most significant thing in the spectacle presented by the international world today. The most significant thing in the ongoings of life at Rome on that memorable day of the year 404 of our era which saw the last gladiatorial combat in the colosseum was not that, four hundred years after the incoming of Christianity, with its teachings of the sanctity of human life, gladiators fought on the arena to make a holiday for Rome; the significant thing was that protest made by the Christian monk Telemachus and sealed by his martyr death, for that announced the birth into the Roman world of a new conscience, and that, through an ethical necessity, meant the speedy abolition of "the human sacrifices of the amphitheater."

And so today the significant thing in the international situation that confronts us is not that nineteen hundred years after the advent of a religion of peace, and good-will among men the earth is still the arena of bloody fratricidal war, and resounds with the din of stupendous preparations for war; the significant thing is the constantly growing protest against it all, for that announces the birth into this modern world of a new international conscience, and that, through an ethical necessity like that which abolished forever the bloody sacrifices of the colosseum, means, at a time not remote as history reckons time, the disarmament of the nations, the beating of their swords into ploughshares and their spears into pruning hooks, and the abolition of war as a crass negation of human solidarity and kinship and a venturesome denial of a moral order of the world and the sovereignty of conscience.

PROFESSOR USHER:

We have with us this afternoon a gentleman who has long been identified with the Peace Movement, whose work as soldier, lecturer, editor, Chicago clergyman, organizer,

demonstrator and more things I can not remember has never prevented his taking an active interest in the propagation and spreading of the idea of peace. I have great pleasure in introducing to you one of the most fervent, able workers in the Peace Movement today—Mr. Jenkin Lloyd Jones.

The Three Steps of Disarmament

JENKIN LLOYD JONES.

Mr. Wallace, Wallace the great scientist, makes out a list of the triumphs of the nineteenth century,—triumphs in science, economics and morality. In this list he marshals fifteen superlative accounts which he places over against all of the other triumphs of man over matter and over nature since the story of man on the earth began. But over against these fifteen marvelous achievements of the nineteenth century he places three pathetic failures, three awful disappointments, the first and chief of which is what he calls, and I think we have taken the word out of his mouth, many of us, "Modern Militarism;" the second he calls, "The Demon of Greed," the third, "The Spoiling of the Earth." Over against its great scientific achievements the century has allowed humanity to sink in the scale by developing what we call "Militarism," and by fostering a terrible greed, "The Demon of Greed," as he calls it, which is impelling man to get himself gigantic fortunes in unspeakably short time out of the toil and sweat of countless multitudes; and then by the reckless wasting of earth's resources, "The Spoiling of the Earth." What is this Militarism? It is something more modern than war. Because war used to be born out of the passions of men. It represented the pugilistic nature of man. But this modern thing is the most cold-blooded, deliberate, scientific thing imaginable. There is not anybody mad that is voting for battleships. There is not anybody excited about it. It is simply some insidious, diabolical intellectualism that conceives that by the multiplication of these instruments of death somehow the prestige and power of the nation and the superiority of the individual is enhanced thereby. I fully agree with the brother that has just spoken. You can not make war so

formidable that human nature will desist, for human nature is made of plucky stuff. No danger challenged, no menace to life and limb have ever been presented to human nature but what it has been equal to the job. I fully agree with the brother also that you can not make war so expensive that people will desist, for human nature is reckless and there is an element of the gambler in the most cold-headed economist. And, however black you may pile up the astounding figures of the cost of armaments, still there are those who, in the name of business, and a certain group of bankers who will freely and frankly vote these suicidal debts. You can not scare men into peace and you can not persuade them out of war for economic reasons though the reasons are unanswerable and unsurmountable. It must be as my brother has said, in an appeal to conscience. The weapons with which we wage this war against war must be the weapons that are put into our hands by the school, by the scientist, by the biologist if you please. We must begin and let the children understand that the fang and the claw and the horn belong to the lower branches of the tree of life. And there they may have had a place in the development of life on this earth. But up on the upper branches of the tree of life the horns have been aborted, the claws have given way to fingers and the fang has been supplanted by the tongue that can speak words of tenderness and with lips that can kiss.

We are confronted by the great mountainous paradox of the twentieth century, reason, religion, morals, economics, history, all the branches of science on the one hand crying out against war; a unanimous chorus rising from the universities of the world against it. On the other hand is steadily increasing armament. The continuous rolling like a snowball of the awful debts and expenses burn all of the world. Never since time began have there been so many men withdrawn from the constructive and creative forces of life in the interest of war as now. But barring a negligible quantity when we take the statistics of the whole world, or the western world, Europe and America—barring the negligible quantity that we have seen engaged in a pitiful murder contest in the Balkans—we are practically at peace. Four million

is the last figure—and every time I speak it I want to add something because each new table of statistics that comes to us increases it. But it is safe to say that there are four million men, able-bodied, in the prime of life, withdrawn from the creative and constructive and humane industries of the world that they may languish lazily in the fields of Mars, ready to destroy life. And these four million actual soldiers mean an investment of life and energy of at least twice that many. About a hundred years ago a Parisian cartoonist, indicating the sociologic condition of his time, painted a plowman between the horses of his plow and carrying on his shoulder a marquis who was toying with his snuff box, showing that every toiler in the fields of France was at that time carrying an idle and unproductive lord on his shoulder. A modern cartoonist a hundred years later places the same plowman between the same horses of the plow, still bent on the high task of increasing the fertility of the earth and of feeding wife and little ones; but now this modern plowman of France carries upon his shoulder a full armed soldier and on the shoulder of the soldier rides the money lender. Convert that cartoon, not into the dollar and cent equivalent, though our economist will find it interesting, but I want you to convert that cartoon into its humane and humanizing equivalent. How long must the peasant maintain his place between the horses of the plow while in addition to the dependencies of wife and little ones and his obligation to church and neighborhood and school he must meet these other cruel extortions that go to maintain not only the modern soldier, and he is an expensive chap I tell you, but the man who lends money and gets interest on the equipment. So I say, the problem of disarmament is a problem—is an ethical problem. We must present it in its spiritual ugliness, the hideousness of armament, the wickedness of the gun. The barbarity of a battleship! It belongs to an era of life that we are outgrowing, that we are leaving behind.

Perhaps you would not think it, but you scratch me anywhere and you will find a farmer. I have lived in Chicago thirty-five years and I have not got all the hayseed out of my hair yet. (Laughter and applause). Two or three Jer-

sey calves up there in Wisconsin which I have are calling me this very minute. Now, we farmers, particularly in the North Central West, the farmers of Illinois, and Iowa, Wisconsin and Minnesota, have learned the humanity as well as the economy of the dehorning of the herds. We have realized that the civilized cow has no earthly use for horns. They are first, last and all the time a menace. The Texas steer, with branching weapons, is gone. You do not find him even in Texas. The intelligent farmer is breeding off the horns as fast as he can, and when he can not breed them off fast enough he saws them off. It hurts like the pulling of a tooth, but ever after the political economy of the barnyard is permanently changed. The best you can say about a well-ordered barnyard with horned catlte is that it maintains a state of armed neutrality, that is what they call it down at Washington. And everything goes pretty well until some wriggly steer begins to steer, and then I should bet upon it there is a hacking around there and it is some innocent little heifer that did not do a thing that gets gored. But when the horns are off, then not until then the cows bunch together; they make common cause against winter sleet and summer flies. Co-operation and unity enter the barnyard, when the horns are off. Now, friends, this is no joke, it is an argument. (Continued applause). It is a plain hard argument. What we need is to dehorn the nations, and the moment they are dehorned, the nations themselves will discover to their unspeakable delight the joy of co-operation and the possibility of fraternity and the gratification of communal exchange of commodities.

It is hard to speak in this presence, knowing that no matter what we say is bringing coals to Newcastle. You have heard this over and over again. But you mothers and you school ma'ams go home and tell the story of the Christ of the Andes. You all know it or you would not be here, but shame on your school if I go into it as I have and ask the eighth grade and high school and college circles, "You know the story of the Christ in the Andes? How many of you have heard of it?" Nobody. The same old story of how Argentina and Chili suspected one another, started out to

now
the same
over
unity

provoke the deadly duel by ordering battleships and increasing the armaments that the ambiguous boundary line that ought to run along the backbone of South America, the watershed of the Andes—how that should be settled—and how battleships were ordered and soldiers were being drilled and various enmities engendered, when two humble priests—were they messengers of the Prince of Peace?—one in Chili and one in Argentina began to plead and to claim there was a better way, until at last haltingly and hesitatingly the two republics consented to submit the question to the settlement of the King of England; and he with a foresight and a sense and a common sense not common with kings (laughter), instead of calling in admirals and generals, instead of calling in a lot of ambassadors and lawyers and dukes and things as is the custom of kings, he asked some men, some geographers to take the problem in hand. And they, with their geographical knowledge and the instruments of science, after due deliberation established the boundary line which was acceptable to both.

Then it was a woman. You up-to-date women, I wish you knew of her name and work here more than you do—Señora de Costa. How many of you know about her? A great stillness. They didn't cheer her. Let us all that know about it go home and tell about it. How that woman, the leader of what in this country would be one of our great progressive movements said, "Now is the time to find some use for these rusty cannon and the old worn-off implements of war. Let us gather them together and melt them and cast them into the noble form conceived by a young artist of Buenos Ayres." And so there was cast that heroic figure of the Christ, thirty feet high and holding the cross five feet above his head standing on a granite pedestal that weighed thirteen or fourteen tons. And this work of art inspired by love, encouraged by woman, was hauled up the mountain side on the now empty carriages of cannons until they found the great eagle's nest, over fourteen thousand feet above the sea there on the boundary line where one could look towards the Pacific and the Atlantic and nothing to break the view. The Chili soldiers and representatives were marshaled there and took line

on the Argentina side and the Argentina soldiers took position on the Chili side. There they knelt and with bare heads vowed eternal peace between the nations and declared that the Christ in the Andes should stay there as long as bronze lasts, in testimony of the fraternal settlement of what a few years before threatened to be the cause of endless war. Forthwith Chili converted her war appropriation towards the development of a pier in the Pacific Ocean. Some of the fortresses, at least one, I believe, has been actually dismantled and made the site of a college. Go now and do likewise; go tell the fools of Europe that there is a better way. Disarmament—these are the steps; first a limitation of armament, then a reduction and then a disarmament. And when you begin going that way it will go fast.

But in order to do that there must be another process that goes along with it. There must be greater confidence in diplomacy. We must try to do things like gentlemen and ladies and not like soldiers and those who are in the arena, getting at one another in this shape (indicating), watching lest some one gets an open way. Nobody knows how much has been accomplished, can be accomplished by simply being polite, by the simple politeness among nations that now obtains among gentlemen. We give credit and I join in the great credit to Theodore Roosevelt for bringing an end to the horrible war between Japan and Russia. (Applause). But really, honor bright, he did not do much. (Applause). It did not take much. All he did in the world was to say, "Gentlemen, come over here and see if you can not fix that up in our back yard." They were both mighty glad to come. They were both sick of the job. Both glad to be shown a way out of it. And so, by diplomacy, which we have never yet worked on the basis that there is a fraternity of interests, a community of interests between nations instead of an antagonism of interests—we want to work diplomacy on that assumption. Then we come to the limitation of armaments which will be speedily followed by the reduction of armament, and at last a disarmament and the establishment, for the benefit of the compact, of an international police, who will see to it that every member in the compact of nations will

behave themselves. We talk about our guns being built, our battleships being floated for the sake of peace! Whenever an outrage is perpetrated against international honor, the big doers of the capitals of the world sit around sucking their thumbs, never saying a word until the mischief is done. If we ever had any use for guns and battleships, either in Germany or England or France or the United States this last year, we ought to have sailed right into the Bosphorous and dropped anchor in front of Constantinople and said to those fellows to keep hands off each other and submit their grievances to arbitration. Talk about national honor and problems that are not negotiable! That is not the word that is used—justiceable—that always chokes me. (Laughter). Well, Great Heavens! How is a question to be settled if it is not by an appeal to court, to law and order? It makes me think of two neighbors whose accounts have gotten so complicated they can not be understood, and they say, "Well, we can't post the books, they are hopeless. Let's go out in the back yard and fight it out." Is that the better way to straighten out the accounts? When the highest accounting skill available has been put upon the books, that decision is the best that can be reached. It may not be perfect, that is not expected, but outside of heaven there is nothing so near right as the judgment of disinterested men—there is nothing so near right. (Applause).

Then what can we do by diplomacy? We can neutralize the Philippines as they have the Netherlands, Norway, Belgium and Switzerland, the Straits of Magellan and Luxemburg. Why under the sun don't we fix that up. Then we can neutralize the Panama Canal as Great Britain has the Suez. Instead of planting cannon there plant roses. Would to God that the construction of the Panama Canal had been postponed a half century so that the moral spirit of the United States could have kept up with its engineering skill. They have got ahead of us, those engineers. They have accomplished a beautiful, noble thing and they find the moral sense of the United States lagging behind, unworthy of their triumphs. Thrice shame on such outrage upon science and the high and noble achievements of the men of science—but

this is to be a symposium and not a speech. I am going to have my chance at the meeting tonight again and I think I had better stop here. I want to see somebody else have a joke.

VOICES:

Go on—go on.

MR. JONES:

What have I been trying to say? Let us be plain about it. Human nature is not going to be scared into peace. Thank heaven it is made of too heroic stuff. Human nature can not be brought into peace for prudential reasons, for it is made of too plucky stuff for that. But human nature is an educatable quantity and it is the reason that is to be developed and the conscience that is to be trained, and it is by an appeal, by the lesson that comes to us from the men of science, from the college halls. We want to lift our boys and girls above that belittling enthusiasm that rejoices in one's own country to the contempt and antagonism of another. (Applause). "He knows no language who knows but one," is the dictum of the new school. Now it says the business of this establishment is to tell the children, "He loves no country who loves but one." Let the Stars and Stripes be flung to the breeze but it is misunderstood and unappreciated until it is rimmed by the symbols of all the other colors of the globe. (Applause). Place around that banner the shamrock of Ireland, the thistle of Scotland, the leek of Wales, the roses of England, the cornflower of Germany, the violet of Greece, the lily of France—and only when this is done does Old Glory become glorious in the estimation of your children and in the estimation of the true citizen.

I like a story that comes to us from Santiago Bay; how, when the modern equipment of the American vessels made easy work of the rotten hulks of Spain and ship after ship was destroyed, the enthusiasm of the Yankee gunners arose with the inspiration of the battle and cheer after cheer broke from the boys in the sulphur smoke, then it was that Commander Phillips, rising above the inspiration of war into the

higher realm of humanity, said, "Don't cheer, boys, the poor devils are dying over there." I like to tell the story, how, when at last the flagship of the Spanish flotilla received its deadly wound and it reeled and went below and the venerable old admiral had nothing to do but throw off his sword and his epaulets and trust himself in his underclothes to the briny deep, when the Yankee soldier pulled him up and he walked on the planks of the conquering ship dripping in salt sea water in his underclothes there was something about the occasion, something about the man, something unparalleled in the inspiration of battle which led the private soldier, without orders, walking his beat with his gun, suddenly to stop and present arms. Whom did he salute? The conquered admiral? No. The representative of an enemy nation? No. Simply a plain grand old man in his humility and in his dignity. I like to believe that that private soldier and Commander Phillips were the products of the American schools that taught the principles of a fraternity that was not to be dimmed by battle. And it is in this appeal to the common humanity, this brotherhood of nations, that we are to put an end to this survival of barbarism. Oh, it is a big job! But we are equal to it if we ally ourselves to the higher forces. And never if we expect to accomplish it by the trickery of diplomacy or by the audacity of guns and battleships. I suppose if one was to ask for a concrete synthesis of the highest achievement of mechanical arts, something wherein all the triumphs of chemistry, of mineralogy, and mechanics are condensed, we could pretty nearly safely point to a modern battleship. I can think of no contrivance of man that has so successfully focalized and syntheticized so many elements of laboratory and workshop as a battleship. What a horrible comment that is on the ethical standards of our nation. Have we no higher use to which to put the discoveries of the laboratory and the elements of the forge and the machine shop than in perfecting this devilship of destruction? And like all modern contrivances it is about the most uncertain thing that is made. You never know when the blasted thing will blow up. The most dangerous place in the neighborhood of the big fourteen-inch gun is at the breach. It kills more in its

kick than it ever will in its shot. Really, the most dangerous place to get under the flag today is to get into a modern battleship. Because you don't know when it goes off. You don't know how to handle it. Do you remember this—I was going to quit fifteen minutes ago—do you remember the gem of the English exhibit at the World's Fair? That beautiful model of their latest battleship, Victoria? A model thirty feet long resplendent in nickel and silver and polished brass? It was a thing of beauty we all had to confess. A few months after, that Victoria that represented at the time the last letter in the creation of battleships, the best England could do playing at war, on a beautiful summer afternoon on the still waters of the Mediterranean bumped into a companion ship by sheer accident and went below, dragging the larger part of its crew with it. An economist at that time figured that England—that fifty years would not see the end of the financial disaster that came to the English Government in that one loss of a crack battleship which went down while it was playing at war on a beautiful sunny afternoon on a glassy sea. He traced the grim disaster into the widow pensions, orphan homes and all of the serio-comic unrecorded disasters that belong to battleships. But let us appeal to the highest in man, let us insist upon the universal element that binds all nations together, that makes Hong Kong and London and New York more intimate in their relations commercially and humanely and in a cultural way than were Boston and San Francisco and Chicago, or the Indian Camp, where Chicago was, a hundred years ago. The nations are more nearly allied now in sympathy and interest than were the counties of New York in the days of the Dutch forefathers. We are coming together. We are being knit together unconsciously, knit together by all the instrumentalities of civilization except the great grim instruments of war. (Continued applause).

A DELEGATE:

I think Mr. Jones has overlooked to mention the influence of women in this new civilization.

MR. JONES:

Bless your soul, there are twenty points I did not mention. But let me bring that in now. I will make atonement by saying this: So far as I know a great poet was caught in a speech only once in his life and that speech was reported when he returned after twenty-five years absence. They caught him and he had to make a speech. In that speech he said, "I pin my hope of the future on two classes. They are to bring in the new world, 'The working man and the woman.'"

PROFESSOR USHER:

We have had first a story of the collegian who has studied the life of the past and drawn from it a conclusion of peace. I gave you second a man who from a broad experience of his life has drawn a conclusion of peace, and I give you now a man who is attempting in the councils of the nation in dealing with these great questions of disarmament to arrive at wise conclusions. I have the honor to introduce the Hon. William D. B. Ainey, Congressman from Pennsylvania.

Intellectual and Moral Disarmament

WILLIAM D. B. AINEY.

I would not wish to make any remarks concerning the Peace Movement ere I had expressed the great pleasure and privilege which I feel in the opportunity of being present with you upon this occasion and having the further privilege in the morning hour of listening to that magnificent address from the great peace advocate, our fellow citizen, Mr. Carnegie. It was an inspiration to me as I know it was to you, and I shall go from your beautiful city much impressed and better able to cope with the peace problems than I have been before. And I was very much interested, although I did not hear all of the address of the gentleman who preceded me. He spoke of the Christ of the Andes and held up in vivid picture before you that monument of peace between the great nations of South America. But it put my thoughts along a line that carried me over to the meeting of the Interparlia-

mentary Union not long ago when that distinguished senator from the nearby state, Senator Burton took part in the ceremonies. I wish I could bring to you his remarks—the splendid words and the magnificent tribute he paid to the cause of peace and to the instrumentality of an early arbitration in carrying forward the work of peace. Senator Burton said that through the efforts of Alexander Hamilton and his desire finally was culminated the treaty of peace under which the great boundary line between Canada and the United States has remained for over a century unfortified. The most magnificent memorial of peace between two nations, and not a head has rested on an uneasy pillow because of it! A tribute to the confidence that may be inspired between two elbow-touching neighbors who are willing to do away with fortifications and armaments along a great and extensive borderline! And may we not feel gratified at our Christ of the Andes between Canada and the United States? (Applause).

I found the speaker who preceded me had touched the line of thought very similar to that which I desire to present to you. It is that after all, this is an ethical question—this question of disarmament. I am going to emphasize another thought in connection with it and insist that after all is said and done, it is an individual question. The disarmament, like the dehorning of the cattle, has got to be an individual disarmament, an individual dehorning if you please. The brain bristling with bayonets and the long line of tradition of war has got to be eliminated from the individual so that the heredity in his life and purpose shall not breathe of war but breathe of peace before we come to the culmination of all our desires. I was thinking as he spoke of this, that after all is said and done only through the individual expression of life can we come to the heights of our ideals in any undertaking. If we educate ourselves along the lines that shall lead us to be the kind of men and women, boys or girls we were intended to be, shall we not fulfill the purpose of our creation exceptionally and very effectively work out this problem of world peace?

I desire to speak to you just a few moments concerning certain phases of world peace as it might be exemplified in the individual life. We are going to come, we are going to bring about the result for which we are working, but if it does not come quite as quickly as you and I might wish, we should not be discouraged. If the oft-repeated expression desirous of world peace, desirous of disarmament—if it could have been made effective, it would have long since accomplished the result. For the people of the world have given assent that war should cease but wars do not cease. The greatest and best in many lands have devoted time, talent and much money to the cause of peace, yet wars have not come to an end and the white winged omen of peace has found no permanent resting place—yea, has been put to flight before the attack of the black pinioned prey bird of war. In the twinkling of an eye the sun is o'ercast and the sky brings up the dark clouds and you hear the mutterings of war and the sky-premonitory bursting of the war cloud o'er the earth. We enter into the most solemn international agreements and then we strain the ropes by which we have bound the war god by assuming a bellicose attitude and by haggling over the meaning of a phrase. The nations enter into arbitral treaties, but we oft refuse or fail to arbitrate. We establish a Hague Court—the most magnificent conception of the ages—but it does not wholly stay the hand raised to its brother's hurt. We hold peace conferences and pass peace resolutions but war resists the fiat of our pleadings and our legislation. Nearly all of the civilized nations of the world have given recognition to the Interparliamentary Union, yet the union last year found a new meeting place because an assenting nation had recourse to arms. Through the generous thought and glorious purpose of our most distinguished citizen, an international monument to the cause of peace now points its pinnacles to the sky, yet before the date of its solemn dedication nations pledged to the principle of arbitration for which this peace temple stands are at each other's throats. By legislation we propose to pull the wolf's teeth, by reducing military and naval programs, and behold, the world's expenditure is greater than ever before. And when there is a

reduction many stand aghast at the possibility, if not the imminence of a war for which some feel we are not prepared. And so disarmament, and if that be the index, world's peace, may seem further removed than ever before.

What shall we say in the face of this arraignment? Shall the advocates of peace admit defeat? God forbid. For my part I am not pessimistically inclined, and I can discern a decided advance through these splendid instrumentalities now at the world's disposal, administered so largely through the great peace societies of the world. It behooves us, however, to face conditions, to analyze the facts, to establish the truth in order that we may at least place the emphasis of our future efforts where it will count. The subconscious man is armed with war-like traditions, the generations of his ancestry have bequeathed him a warlike spirit and tendency. The poet's martial song has inspired the countless generations and the historian's page replete with valorous victories has fired the imagination of all mankind and turned many a nation's thoughts to fields of battle until the vainglorious god of war sends forth his challenge as he recounts his list of mighty men and says, "Who is so effeminate as to champion the cause of quiet peace against the brilliant gallantry of war?" The imagery of war running back into the misty path has clothed war in the garb of patriotism and decked it with a virtue not its own, until the glamor hides its awfulness. Deep down, hidden away in the emotional life of every man and woman, every boy and girl, is the accumulated, though perhaps unconscious and latent heritage ready to spring forth with volcanic abruptness at the sound of the bugle or the country's call to arms. It lies far below and is not always reached by the intellect. So that man may logically consider and give intellectual assent to the propositions of peace, and yet on some sudden turn the dormant emotional side may find him allied with the hosts of war. While educating the intellect, let us not forget to educate or train the emotional and subconscious element in our nature, that element which quickly responds to love and hate, sympathy and kindness, and expresses joy and sorrow. It is not long since that a distinguished gentleman of our country made a splendid address

in one of our legislative halls in opposition to armament—increased armament. It was widely circulated and read, but the same gentleman sent a chain shot telegram across the country hot with belligerency, couched in language calculated to provoke the passion and arouse the prejudices of two nations, even taking them to the threshold of war. That distinguished citizen of our land, who has done much in the interest of peace, Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler, has expressed the thought in splendid words, saying world peace is to be built upon the foundation of the establishment of an international mind. In an address which I was privileged to make not long since, I ventured to place beside that the expression that world peace could only be maintained by the establishment, not only of the international mind, but, trespassing on the thought of the gentleman that has preceded me, the establishment of an international morality. The reason I make the utterance is that after all peace is a moral proposition and we must find its real foundation in the moral nature, and like all moral truths its highest expression and lodgment is along the emotional side of man's life. The giant intellect does not always possess the moral sense—intellectual assent is not enough to firmly stand against an untrained or contra-trained moral or emotional nature. Life must have emotional expression. When all are agreed that war should cease, and national officialdom gives its assent thereto, and when war does not cease, we find no other reason for the failure. This generation still has a latent war spirit; the brain bristles with bayonets; hearts are masked batteries, and thoughts are as quickly kindled and as inflammable as Greek fire. All our activities we protect by fortifications behind which we have installed the disappearing guns of prejudice and passion and call them national honor and patriotism. The disarmament, therefore, which must ultimately come in the development of the peace project is intellectual disarmament. Disarm the mind and heart and you will soon disarm the nation. Work out from the individual to the world. The point I seek to make is that our most effectual efforts are educational, not legislative, except that as legislative efforts are in turn edu-

cational. When you have educated the heart of these great nations to grasp the awfulness of war, and thus supplant its false and chimerical glories, then you have gone far toward reaching the goal of your ambition. I believe that the great work of Mr. Carnegie, of the Hague Court, the arbitral treaties and arbitrations, the peace societies are finding a full fruition in that way. In a sense we must change the old type. Are the people of Israel journeying forty years in the wilderness in order that the people whose heart craved for Egypt may pass away? May it not be that time will aid us in the solution of this problem? We should not get discouraged because of seeming delays. When peace had fled from the habitation of Israel and an unsheathed sword hung over the land, Elijah despondent and discouraged stood on the mountain top and sought relief. And the mighty wind arose and rent the mountain and broke the rock, but the Lord of Peace was not in the wind. Then came the earthquake which shook to the very center the foundation of the earth, but the Lord of Peace was not that instrument. And then came the devastating fire to ravage the land, but the God of Peace was not there. And lastly came the still small voice. It spake to the heart and the conscience of Elijah and gave him peace. The great God of Peace must speak to the human heart, wherein are the pent up emotions which sway and make the life of men and nations. And from the lodgment of the words of the still small voice will come "Peace on earth, good will toward men," and lead us to an eternal hope and confidence in the ultimate triumph and great destiny of our beloved land. Turning our gaze to the past and then to the future, we may well adopt the words of another who spake in hopefulness; "We have journeyed in safety through the wilderness and crossed the Red Sea of civilized strife and the foot of Him that led us hence has not faltered, nor the light of his countenance been turned away."

PROFESSOR USHER:

Mr. Arthur Henry Dadman, Secretary of the Navy League of the United States, has asked the privilege of speak-

ing to this meeting in order to bring forth certain provisions of the peace work of the Navy League.

The Navy League

ARTHUR HENRY DADMAN, Secretary.

As a representative of the Navy League of the United States, I come before this Peace Congress to ask recognition of the Navy League as a Peace Society. The League stands on the platform voiced so many times by George Washington "to be prepared for war is one of the most effective means of preserving peace."

Our President, General Horace Porter, was a delegate to the Second Hague Peace Conference and labored valiantly for the general arbitration treaties, and as far as conditions permitted for an international agreement for the limitation of armaments. Among our honorary Vice-Presidents is Senator Elihu Root, who, as Secretary of the State, tried in every way possible to secure the consent of European powers to discuss the limitations of armaments at the Second Peace Congress. You all doubtless are aware that he failed, for the European powers refused to enter the Conference, if the limitation of armament was included in the topics to be considered. Senator Root is now President of the American Society of International Law and the Carnegie Peace Fund. As one who has worked earnestly for arbitration and limitation of armament, he, nevertheless, at the last session of Congress, voted for three new battleships.

Among our other Vice-Presidents is the Hon. Joseph H. Choate, who in an address delivered in Carnegie Hall, February 20, 1910, said, "It is absolutely essential for this country to maintain its navy * * * the cheapest defense of our nation * * * . It was my good fortune to attend the Hague Peace Conference two years ago. Side by side with the delegates of the United States sat the delegates from the ancient kingdom of Spain, and they labored with us for general peace and arbitration, as a means of eliminating the horrors of war. I felt then, as I do now, that it was the

weight of our navy that gave force to our words at that Peace Conference." If Ambassador Choate is right and we enter the 1915 Hague Conference with a fifth rate navy and a weak naval policy, the American delegation's influence will be fifth rate also.

Some of the most active and useful Navy League members are men, who, from twenty to fifty years ago, graduated from Annapolis and afterwards resigned from the service. Believing in a strong navy as the guarantee of peace, they are giving of their time and money from an unselfish, patriotic motive, to the work of the Navy League, which is an educational work; and consists in letting the people of the country know the real needs of the navy, and informing them as to the reasons for maintaining a strong navy. Among the honorary vice-presidents of the league are Cardinal Gibbons, Dr. Lyman Abbott, Benjamin Ide Wheeler and Thomas A. Edison.

Every dollar received by the Treasurer of the Navy League is given by members in the shape of fees and contributions from a purely unselfish, patriotic motive.

Woodrow Wilson, in writing of the War of 1812, refers to it as "a war of arms brought on by a program of peace." The fact that the army had been disbanded and the navy dismantled in 1812 did not prevent our people and Congress from rushing into war because of the unjust seizure of American vessels and seamen. Six months before the Civil War, a bill was introduced into Congress to abolish the navy and the Civil War found the country unprepared. A strong navy, that could have speedily blockaded the Southern ports, would have stopped the export of cotton in exchange for arms and ammunition, and would have hastened the conclusion of the war.

A study of the last fifteen years furnishes evidence that wars are as frequent and severe today as during any other similar period of the world's history. The country found in 1898 that it was necessary to go to war to establish peace. The eternal question, "Am I my brother's keeper," was asked the country. Already one million of women and children, as well as men, had lost their lives in the Cuban Rebellion.

The Spanish-American War cost the lives of perhaps three thousand sailors and soldiers, but it brought about peace. Had the United States refrained from intervention, one, two, and perhaps three million more lives might have been needlessly lost. It is easy to conceive of similar conditions, where for the sake of righteousness, humanity and even peace, the United States may have to go to war. The United States navy is not simply for coast defense; it is the strong arm to make effective certain great American policies, which we believe are for the benefit of all peoples. The Monroe Doctrine, unquestionably international, makes for peace in the western hemisphere. The restriction of Oriental immigration means the preservation of the American standards. The open door of trade in China and the integrity of China are for the benefit of all China and all mankind.

We have assumed the responsibility of maintaining the neutrality of the Panama Canal and safeguarding the ships of belligerents while passing through the Panama Canal in time of war. We have, through the Senate and House Resolutions, announced our attitude toward strategic harbors near the Carribean Sea, that are suitable for coaling and naval stations.

These great American policies are, for the most part, altruistic, but from every standpoint, have a close relationship to the ultimate welfare of the American people.

In our great cities it is frequently necessary to have on hand a police force, armed with stick and revolver, to maintain law, order and peace. In the same way, it has been necessary for our State and Navy Departments to send out, since the Spanish-American War, some thirty odd Marine Corps expeditions, as in the case of the Boxer outbreak, the insurrection of the natives of Samar, the Cuban and Mexican troubles. No name can actually be given to most of these expeditions, no warship fired a gun and comparatively few marines were wounded or killed in land encounters. Nevertheless, the general purpose of peace and order was maintained through a display of force. An international navy to preserve international peace may seem to be far off, but it is

evident navies will be needed of some character as long as police forces are necessary in our cities.

John Fiske, the historian, says: "Obviously, the permanent peace of the world can be secured only through the gradual concentration of the preponderant military strength into the hands of the most pacific communities."

A modern navy can not be impoverished. In times of peace we must prepare for more peace by being prepared for war. A display of force on the part of an enlightened government, seeking righteousness, invariably makes it unnecessary to use force.

We must fight injustice and greed and other elementary causes of war, but do not fight the idea of preparedness and being in a position to display great force, which is the surest guarantee of peace in time of international difficulty.

The vast majority of Americans agree that we should have an adequate navy. The question is, what is an adequate navy? This is where we disagree. I hold firmly to the opinion that a navy not strong enough is not worth the cost. Better to have no navy at all than to have a weak navy.

In formulating a naval policy, which the country so much needs, to take the place of the present haphazard method for making appropriations for naval construction, we should have a navy not only strong enough for coast defense and to make effective American policies, but a navy strong enough to meet any possible military opponent.

The matter of formulating a naval policy and recommending it to Congress can well be left to the proposed Council of National Defense. This Council would not be a military body; it would consist of four executives, eight legislators and four experts, viz.: the President, the Secretaries of the State, War and of the Navy; the chairman of the Senate and House Committee on Foreign Affairs, Appropriations, Army and Navy Affairs; the Presidents of the Army and the Navy War Colleges; a naval officer and the Chief of the General Staff of the Army.

I am fully aware that under present conditions, if Congress should provide for such a Council of National Defense to formulate a naval policy, the majority of the members of

this Council would be one-battleship men. Nevertheless, co-operation between the executive and legislative departments and the experts, as well, is much to be desired for the sake of increased efficiency and economy, and I am convinced that when such a body, having the responsibility of formulating a naval policy, made a thorough study of the question, they would finally decide on a policy that would, in the end, furnish a navy, first—strong enough for coast defense; second—strong enough to make effective American policies, and third—strong enough to meet any possible military opponent. In any event, the make-up of the proposed Council is entirely logical and in line with the modern tendency to secure complete facts and full information, that policies may be adopted and continuous programs planned for.

Let me say in conclusion that we firmly believe in arbitration as a principle. We believe in the navy by international agreement, but we must keep in mind that still the Czar of Russia has the fixing of the Hague program. The Czar of Russia called the first conference for the limitation of armament and they passed two or three resolutions. That was eminently desirable in itself, but they could go no further because two European powers refused to enter that conference if it was put on the program for discussion.

We all believe in the ultimate limitation of armament, of the ultimate international navy or whatever it is going to be, but here before us we have the experience of history, we have before us the belief and the faith of men like Senator Root, the leader in the Peace Foundation; and then men like Joseph Choate, who have had experience. We realize that we are our brother's keeper, that there are certain policies and certain things for the making of a higher civilization which rest in us, and we will be judged by the way we handle them. We have got to acquit ourselves like men and be strong.

PROFESSOR USHER:

The discussion will be closed from the platform by Dr. Richard. The Chair will entertain any one on the floor who may have something to say.

DISCUSSION.

MR. TRUEBLOOD:

I simply rise to call the speaker's attention to one mistake which, of course, he made without meaning to do so. The matter of the program for the Third Hague Conference is absolutely out of the hands of the Czar of Russia. The Second Hague Conference voted, and the resolution has been ratified by the nations, that the program of the Third Hague Conference should be prepared by an international committee which was to be appointed two years in advance of the Third Hague Conference. This international committee is now being appointed. Our Congress has appointed its members on that committee and this international committee will meet this summer with instructions from all the governments that appoint members. That is the way in which the Third Hague Conference is to be prepared. The Czar of Russia will have absolutely nothing to do with it except the sending of a Russian committee, a constituent part of the committee. You have only to read the report of the Second Hague Conference to verify this.

MR. HUMPHREY:

I am an officer in a peace society, a man of peace, strongly for it, but the platform of the organization which I represent, the American Peace and Arbitration League, has this clause: "We stand for such armament as may be necessary for the national defense to meet existing conditions." I am glad that this Congress has recognized a representative of the Navy League and given the Navy League a chance to be heard. We can afford to hear the argument of those who do not agree with us in many respects and it is a broad piece of policy to do so. Let us keep an open heart, an open house.

We must stand together against war. A soldier is not necessarily for war. General Grant once said to me, "The soldier is not the man who makes wars. It is your commercialism that makes war and when that can not get matters adjusted they call the soldier in to settle it." There is something to think about. My next point is that the peace

societies of the United States should have taken what I think the proper view, that is a view to let it be known that a consistent armament is necessary for the preservation of this country, just as much as it is necessary to have an officer out on your street at night patrolling, not necessarily for clubbing somebody but to be ready to club somebody when the law-breaker appears and for no other purpose. When the peace societies recognize that we have got to have a certain force at hand to preserve civilization, no navy leagues need be organized. If we had taken the proper position the navy league now existing would not have been organized, in my opinion. Unfortunately an army league is now organizing. I believe that is unnecessary. I believe the peace people should support a necessary army and a necessary navy.

Now let us go ahead on our peace proposition, because we have to deal with the nation. We can not make a treaty here, we can only pass resolutions. Remember that the objective of the peace people is the practical that interests politics. Sixty-seven men in the United States Senate and the President of the United States make the treaties. We have now in the State Department twenty-five arbitration treaties. The treaty with Great Britain expires in June; the Panama Canal question has been postponed until December. There is a little friction there temporarily. Let us all support the President of the United States and the United States Senate and see if we can not bring to pass a renewal of that treaty with the great nation of Great Britain, the treaty of arbitration before it expires on June 5th. When we enter into questions like that we are doing some practical peace work.

REV. OTHO BRANT:

I heard a story of a preacher while I was down in Tennessee holding services. I was walking along the street when a man met me and he said, "Are you a preacher?" "Yes, I am," I said. "Well," he said, "we had here in this town last week a powerful preacher; oh, he had a powerful voice, a tremendous voice. He was down praying for more power, for more power, and he was making such a noise he could be heard all over this town, and he was still praying for

more power. A man slapped him on the shoulder and said, 'Preacher, preacher, it is not more power you want, it is more ideas you want in your head.'"

So, I think what we want is the proper idea. I speak to you these few moments today as the son of a veteran, as the son of a man who lost his life in that great Civil War. I was state captain for the State of Pennsylvania of the Sons of Veterans. But I am here today as a friend of peace. I am in full accord with it, my heart is in it, I believe in it. You say that these difficulties between individuals shall not be settled by going out and fighting, and they should not be. And neither should these state difficulties, these national difficulties or international difficulties be settled in that way. You say they should not be but they turn around to us and say they can not be settled in any other way.

Now this peace movement, these conventions, this agitation, will help to prove that things can be settled in some other way without going to war. I attended the dedication of that great monument down in Riverside Park a few years ago and I asked the question of several people, "What do you suppose is the inscription upon that monument, upon the monument of one of the greatest generals in human history?" What do you suppose it was? Perhaps you think it was something of military character, something along the line of war. No, it is nothing of that kind, nothing but these simple words, "Let us have peace." That is the inscription on the monument of the great General Grant in Riverside Park.

MR. OSBORNE:

I am the chairman of the committee of the Navy League delegates who are attending this convention. There seems to be a great misapprehension in the minds of many delegates as to the attitude of the Navy League for universal and international peace and disarmament and as to its right to be classified as a peace society and as to the principles for which it stands. There seems to be an idea that the Navy League stands solely for a big navy, constantly on a war footing, and that this attitude invites attack from others that are jealous.

It is unfortunate that various peace societies are constantly quoting the Navy League and making misrepresentations as to its purpose. The Navy League is just as earnestly a peace society as any here represented. It does not differ in its object but in the method of attaining that object.

At the present time the governing board consists of business men throughout the country. They are not affiliated in any way with any ship building, naval or army store interests. The league is supported by voluntary contributions that come from interested members. The time of the governing board is given gratuitously to the study of commercial problems and to the endeavor of preventing the conditions that exist, through the medium of the Navy League.

Now, the Navy League stands for an adequate navy, for a navy commensurate with the needs of the country. It believes that if this country needs a navy at all it needs an adequate navy, and if we can not have an adequate navy it believes in no navy. An inadequate navy is worse than none. It is not the province of the Navy League to determine what is an adequate navy. That is left to the experts of the country who give all of their time and knowledge to its study. Our Government has a committee on foreign affairs and if this department demands more ships than it did a few years ago it is because conditions have arisen that make a larger navy necessary. The ships that we are building are not for today or tomorrow, but for some time in the future. And we believe if we have enough of them we will not be called upon to use them.

PROFESSOR USHER:

We close the discussion because it is necessary to end this session in time to allow those who are here to attend the reception at the Wednesday Club. It is my pleasure to introduce Dr. Ernst Richard, president of the German-American Peace Society of New York City.

DR. RICHARD:

I can not say that I entirely agree with any of the speakers. Though I agree with the gentlemen who say it is

an ethical question, yet there is a practical side to it. If I agree with the gentlemen who say that it is a question of education of the youth, certainly that means it is a question of the future. It means shifting the responsibility from ourselves onto the shoulders of those that come. The question is, "What can we do today?" We of the living generation of voters, "What can we do today?" That is what we have to look at. It is our duty and our responsibility to see that our representatives in Congress do the right thing on this question. What do you think the other side is doing? The Navy League and the Army League are not the worst by any means. There are nine hundred retired and active officers in Washington, who live there, reside there. That means two for every Congressman. And they are there all of the time and talk to them and influence them, and if there is any bill up in regard to the navy or the army, you should see how the Representatives and Senators are flooded by letters and telegrams from all parts of the country. That is because they are organized. Our militia is an organization which maintains armories in this country, and if they want something they simply have to send one telegram to forty-eight state headquarters and it reaches every Congressional delegation. A few days after and telegrams begin coming into Washington. What are we doing? (We hold congresses and pass resolutions. We don't amount to much.) We must protest whenever such measures are up and we must watch because they try to get them through sneakingly, like that military pay bill that was put across during the last session. A law passed that says that every private of the militia, for the forty-two times he is to practice evenings during the year, shall receive one-third of the pay of the soldier of the regular army. Nobody knew anything about it. There was not a dozen newspapers of the country reported it. Nobody looked after it.

And I don't agree that it is wholly an international question. There are a number of things we can do without waiting for the others; but that is a subject I will discuss Saturday afternoon. I am prepared now, today and any time, to contend with those that say that in times of peace prepare

for war. In times of peace prepare for peace; prepare against war, not for war. They say these armies are the insurance against war. That is a queer insurance; we pay fire insurance and when the house burns we get the money back. If we pay war insurance in the shape of money for the army and navy and the undesired war comes, then we lose our premiums and we have war besides. That is the kind of insurance they want to give us. I am not here to argue why we don't believe in a navy and an army. Mr. Carnegie has done that this morning very eloquently. I could only repeat what he said. There is nobody in the whole wide world who wants war with us. They make more money out of us than they can win by war. They sell their goods to us. Who is going to fight his best customer? Nobody is such a fool. They could not win anything by it. Why, the secretary of the Navy League sent out a circular last year telling us to join. He stated that Germany intended to take Brazil and so on and a number of things like that.

MR. DADMAN:

As secretary of the Navy League I must emphatically state that I recall no such circular.

DR. RICHARD:

I do not know whether you personally sent it, but it was in the National Tribune. If they would take Brazil, I do not know what their benefit would be. Now they sell their goods and it does not cost them anything. If they would go and conquer a part of Brazil, which is not saying they would succeed in doing so, they would have to pay for the management of the government and now they get it all for nothing.

The principal point I want to make is this: I believe honestly that many of the people who say we must acquire a navy and army do so because they believe we are goody-goody—very pacific. I believe they honestly think so. They think we are the goody-goodies. But no one can be pacific if his neighbors do not want him to be. Why should we be the pacifier if the other people of the world be of the same state of civilization as we are? If they think we will have a

powerful navy and a powerful army and that it will be for defense, they are greatly mistaken. It will be a constant temptation to do wrong. It will be "the big stick" in reality. Why, certainly, there will be no bloodshed. If a small republic wants something that is right and we don't want to give it and we have a big navy and they get to asking for their own, we will send our navy there. Why, there is no bloodshed if the highway robber meets you. He takes his revolver and puts it to your forehead and demands your money. There will be no shooting. He is prepared, he prevents bloodshed.

They say we must have a large army and a large navy to prevent war. Do you think Italy would have gone against Turkey if they hadn't had a large army and a large navy? Do you think Italy would have gone against Turkey if they thought they would get licked? No! They had this army, this army which is the terrible burden of Italy's poor. The Italians come here to sell bananas and shine shoes and put the money in the army there. They have to get something for it. There was the instrument, the army; there was Tripoli; they had to have it for prestige—that is what they all say, for prestige—because they have the army and navy.

Another thing; let me call your attention to Germany. Germany is perhaps the only country in the world which lies between eight neighbors; every one of them powerful nations, whose history shows they have had this scourge of militarism. But since the German Empire has been in existence they have entered upon no war whatever and on the other hand they have formed treaties of alliance. They have an ally, Austria-Hungary, too weak for herself to stand against any great power. What did they do? They tore up the sacred treaty three years ago about Bosnia-Herzegovina, and they didn't need to do it. They could have waited three, four or five years and acquired it by pacific negotiations because it was destined to belong to them. Everybody knew they would get it in the long run; but because of the old Emperor they wanted it right now and they annexed it. Why? They knew they had that big army—they knew the German army would have to stand for it. And that is why they had to commit this great wrong. That is the scourge, the temptation of militar-

ism. The man who wants to do wrong, who has the power behind him, is always tempted to do so.

I don't know whether you remember a few years ago a daughter of one of the most respectable families in Washington saw in the garden a boy in the apple tree and having a rifle in the house she shot at him and killed him. Do you think that girl thinks now she did the right thing? Don't you think if she is made of the right stuff she curses the day when that gun was placed in the house? I will not have a gun in my house and I do not allow my son to have one just because such a case may happen. There may be a burglar and I may want to shoot him for the sake of the few trifles he comes after. If I have no gun I can not do it.

Why! It is not so terrible to die. We all are ready to die for our country. And I am ready to fight for it when it is necessary. We all stand here ready with our bodies, ready to defend it. Even those of us who are extremely true and faithful to the Bible and say we will not fight. We are all ready to die for our country, but we are not ready to kill for it. Death is not the worst thing that can happen. And let me tell you another thing. I have voted here six presidential tickets. I am long enough here to talk as an American citizen and know what I am about.

I was born in Germany at the time when the United States did not have any navy worth speaking of and no army worth speaking of. My father always told me about it. Probably that is the reason I am here today, because I learned to love this country of liberty and peace at that time. He told me to look at this republic where the people governed, where there were hardly any ships and no soldiers—no soldier to injure one of the citizens.

Then we went into this business of a large navy. When we sent the grand fleet around the world they say it was a message of peace. But the result of this peace promenade was that whenever they passed a country in South America, those nations who had all decided to abolish their navies, after seeing our big fleet, began to order warships anew. That was the message of peace we brought to them. It was the example we set to them. You do not know, perhaps, that

by this you have given the saddest disappointment to all the friends of liberty and progress and democracy in the world. We always pointed with pride to this great republic and said, "Why! Here is the most respected nation on the face of the globe, without an army or navy, and they hold their own, and are powerful, much more so than other nations who flaunt their navy and army before everybody." What do they say now? They sneer at us. I can show you the books and the articles where they say, "Where are you now with your great republic. Aren't you doing exactly the same thing as we do?" I feel ashamed every time I see this because I have to keep quiet. It is true if we do not look out and if we do not prevent this inroad militarism already has made upon us from spreading further we will fail in our mission in the world. And our mission in this world has been from the foundation of this republic to encourage every liberty-loving father and mother to teach his child that this is the land of hope. It is our mission to show to the world the truth that the only happiness of mankind is where there is a reign of liberty and peace. It is our duty not only to come together and talk, but to watch our Congressman, watch the people you elect to any office, see what they are doing and if they do as they have been doing before. If they think that the American people do not care, wake them up, give them a great deluge by sending them letters of protest from every house and from every voter, and then we will have peace, and not before. (Applause.)

PROFESSOR USHER:

I want to invite you all to join the Missouri Peace Society, those of you who are citizens of Missouri. The meeting will stand adjourned.

INTERSTATE ORATORICAL CONTEST

THE INTER-COLLEGIATE PEACE ASSOCIATION

Thursday Afternoon, May 1, at 4 o'clock

THIRD BAPTIST CHURCH AUDITORIUM

PRESIDENT CHARLES F. THWING, WESTERN RESERVE UNIVERSITY, Presiding;
MR. HUGO MUENCH, MR. PERCY WERNER, MRS. WILLIAM E. WARREN,
SECRETARY JAMES L. TRYON OF THE MASSACHUSETTS PEACE
SOCIETY, PRESIDENT S. C. MITCHELL OF THE UNIVER-
SITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA, Judges.

PRESIDENT THWING:

We are gathered, friends, for a meeting of the Western Branch of the Intercollegiate Peace Association. The Intercollegiate Association is a society organized among the colleges of this country; it now represents many of the colleges of sixteen states. The purpose of the association is to create and promote interest in the peace movement among all college people. The method of carrying out this purpose lies largely in the writing and speaking of orations upon this same great subject. The special means used in carrying out this method lies in the individual college and the individual state selecting from contestants of the men of that college the one who presents and gives the best oration. The men out of the half dozen or so colleges in each state then assemble in a contest and out of that state contest the best man is chosen. All of the colleges contesting these sixteen states are then grouped into three sets or sections: The Eastern, the Central and the Western.

Today we are assembled for the contest of the colleges of the states that form the Western Group. I welcome you to this gathering and bespeak for the contestants your hearty and responsive interest. As you will see from the program, the representatives of the colleges of six states are to speak this afternoon.

The first speaker will be the one who represents Illinois, and who comes from Knox College at Galesburg, Mr. Vernon M. Welsh, who speaks upon "The Assurance of Peace." (Applause.)

The Assurance of Peace

VERNON M. WELSH.

The birth and rapid rise of the present movement for international peace are events of recent years. The nineteenth century found its welcome in the smoking cannon and crimsoned fields of Hohenlinden. At its close the first great peace conference of The Hague was in session. One hundred years ago Napoleon was sweeping across Europe in his terrible attempt to create an empire. Today France, England and America have agreed on treaties that declare for unbroken peace. Touched by the wand of progress the ideal of yesterday has become the dominant political issue of today. It is pertinent then, that we seek the true nature of this revolution. Is it borne on the crest of a popular impulse, or is it a permanent movement; the product of natural forces working through ordinary channels?

The nineteenth century represents a break with the past. Swept into the mighty current of transition the habits and customs of a thousand years have disappeared. With the development of natural resources, the establishment and growth of the factory system, the use of means of rapid communication, nations entered upon a new era. Commerce and industry have come to dominate thought and action and are transforming the very life of the world. Defying the rigorous climate of both poles, trade has penetrated the frozen recesses of Hudson Bay and made of Falkland Island a relay station in the progress of victorious industry. Nor is the equinoctial heat more discouraging. The thick jungles of Africa have yielded their secrets and the muddy waters of the Amazon are churned by propellers a thousand miles from the sea. International trade routes traverse the seas, connecting continent with continent. In forty years this commerce has increased from two billions to thirty billions. Giant corporations have

ignored political boundaries, carried trade wherever profitable, and are supplying the demands of foreign countries. Tariff walls, but lately effective barriers, are crumbling before the onslaughts of trade. Nations are no longer independent. The wheat from Canada and the Dakotas feeds the mill-workers of Sheffield and the nobility of Berlin. The failure of the Georgia cotton crop halts the looms of England and raises the cost of living throughout Europe. Nations can no longer exist as self-sufficient economic units. Never before were they so mutually interdependent. Never before has the welfare and security of one state depended upon the enterprise and diligence of another. And the movement for international peace is the chance offspring of these new social forces; at once a protest and a warning against the wrecking of modern economic structures by the ruthless hand of war.

Commerce, the most important of all, flourishes unprejudiced by armaments and military prestige. In the open competition of the world's markets stronger powers meet and suffer from the rivalry of states that have no military standing. Relative to population, Norway has a carrying trade three times as great as England's. With her million trained warriors, Germany is beaten by the merchants of Holland. The flag of little Denmark flies at more mastheads than do the Stars and Stripes. Where then is the commercial advantage supposed to attend superior military strength?

But it is to prevent the seizure of its commerce by others that nations must empty their treasuries to keep ironclads afloat. Yet what could be gained by attempted confiscation? If Germany annihilated England's navy tomorrow, how would she profit? Commerce is a process of exchange, the continuance and promotion of which is dependent upon the degree of mutual profit. Commercial gain is not a consequent of military success. It is since England seized the gold fields, diamond mines and fertile plateaus of Lower Africa that British securities have dropped twenty points. In 1871 Germany humbled and humiliated France almost beyond toleration, yet her share of the world's commerce has decreased rather than augmented. So would it be with England. True,

Germany might commit some depredations and hinder the passage of trade, but what would be her motive? How could she gain? Even if the British Isles were depopulated it is doubtful whether she would benefit. For by what miracle would Germany be able to develop the facilities, the shipyards, mills, factories, foundries, mines and machinery, to supply the trade which the foremost of commercial nations has been generations in building up? Germany's banner might wave over the Bank of England, her excise boats police the Thames and the Clyde, yet she would behold as in Morocco the trade of a conquered province going to foreign nations. Trade does not follow the flag. Undisturbed by political changes or military reverses it flows in constantly widening channels wherever productive fields are found.

And in the waging of war do we reckon the direct cost to commerce? The commercial relations of the entire world are disturbed. Prolonged conflict is accompanied by the closing of the bank and the factory, the dismantling of the ship and the mill and the lengthening of the bread line in every city and town. In what state of prosperity and happiness might not France and Europe have been, had Napoleon never lived? With half a century gone, our own country is still suffering from the devastation of the Civil War. Our commerce with South America is scarcely beyond the point it had reached before our week-end tiff with Spain. Yet there are those who prate of national honor and of war as ensuring prosperity. From the leader of a new born national party we hear that without a periodic war America would become effeminate and weak; her aggressive commercial life timid and corrupt; and within a few brief years the great republic would sink to a fourth rate power. Up, brave Americans, and man the guns; awake, sons of freedom, and scour the seas; fourteen years without a war, our beloved land is ruined. You men of the factory and mill, you men of property and business, you producers of the nation's wealth, forward into the carnage; burn the homes of thrift and industry, for commerce will be enriched thereby; ravage the fields and despoil the cities, for this will ensure vigorous national life; impoverish happy

peoples, spread famine and pestilence through fertile valleys, mark the sites of contented villages with smouldering ruins, defy your Christian God and kindle the fires of hell in human breasts; commit violence, treachery, rapine, aye, murder, for the eternal glory of the Stars and Stripes. Yet commerce and industry, the glittering prizes which every nation covets when it builds a dreadnaught or enlarges its army, demand that the creative forces of peace supplant the destructive wastes of war.

Today the financial relationships of nations are inextricably entangled. The big banks in the capitals of the world are in communication with each other every second of the day. During the American crisis in 1907 the bank rate in England went up to seven per cent, forcing many British concerns to suspend operations. Because of the Balkan war the bank rate in Berlin, Paris and Vienna is the highest in twenty years and European securities have depreciated over \$6,000,000,000. Foreign investments are raising insuperable barriers to war. Should the French bombard Hamburg today they would destroy the property of Frenchmen. Let Emperor William capture London, loot the Bank of England, and he will return to find German industry paralyzed, the banks closed and a panic sweeping the land. Let English regiments again move to invade the United States, English warships draw up in battle line to attack our seaports, and four billions of the earnings of the English people would bar the way. To the victor of the present the spoils of war are valueless. Japan, victor over the great Russian empire, staggers under a colossal debt. The Italian government hears rumbles of discontent, because the cost of winning a victory has been too great. What better proof do we need that war is profitless; that it means financial suicide? It has been transformed from a gainful occupation into economic folly; and war will cease because the price is becoming prohibitive.

In this movement for peace, capital's strongest ally is her most active enemy. Raised to a position of independence and power by the industrial revolution, Labor is wielding an effective influence. The complexity of modern business has

aroused workingmen in every country to a common interest and sympathy. The International Congress of Trade Unions, representing twenty countries and over ten million men, has declared for universal disarmament. Just last month 85,000 coal miners in Illinois resolved that if the United States declared war on a foreign power they would call a general strike.

And why not? Why should the workingmen of one country offer themselves as targets for those of another? Why should the workers of Germany be taxed to support a war against England, Germany's best market? Can the rice-growers of Japan profit by killing Americans to whom they sell their produce? War means suffering and want and the laborer has come to know it. He is cold to the sight of its flaunting flags and the sound of its grand, wild music, for he sees the larder bare, funds exhausted and hunger at the door. He refuses to sacrifice his body and the welfare of his family upon the altar of Mars. No longer can kings and emperors satisfy their grasping ambitions. Armed by the ballot the masses are today supreme. Never again will the cruel hand of tyranny press to their lips the poisoned cup of death. Their sway is absolute. The destinies of nations are in their keeping. The decree has gone forth that war must cease.

Born of these greater movements, a host of influences brings nearer the dawn of peace. The express and the wireless have displaced the ox cart and the courier. Chicago and Boston are closer today than New York and Albany a century ago. Within the hour of their occurrence events that happen in Paris are published in Chicago and Quebec. Political boundaries are fading before larger interests. Every railroad train crossing a frontier, every ship plying the seas, every article of commerce, every exchange of business, every cable conveying news from distant lands; all these are potent factors in the cause of international peace. Add to these the conciliating influence of foreign investments, the telephone and telegraph, travel, education, democracy, religion, and you have marshaled a host for peace whose clarion trumpets will never sound retreat. Casting aside the prejudice of ages, modern

industrialism flings round the world the economic bonds against which the forces of militarism are powerless.

Here then in the world-wide operations of commerce and industry is the assurance of peace. The skeptic may scoff and the cynic point to Mexico and the Balkans, but the industrial revolution has produced a multitude of influences that are knitting the nations into an indissoluble unity. Men are beginning to realize the integrity of mankind and a world consciousness is arising. Kindness and justice, yesterday but community ideals, are extending their sway throughout the earth. Even while bayonets are bared in conflict and cannon thunder against hostile camps, the magic of our civilization is weaving bonds of union that can not be broken. Peace, not war, is the true grandeur of nations; love, not hate, is the immutable law of God; and so surely as governments and kings are powerless to divide when home and factory would bind, some not too distant day will find the battle-flags all furled, the sword's arbitrament abandoned and the world at peace.

PRESIDENT THWING:

The second speaker represents the State of Iowa. I present to you Mr. D. L. Wickens, of Morningside College, who will speak to you on "The New Patriotism," the greatest factor in the history of nations. (Applause.)

The New Patriotism

D. L. WICKENS.

The greatest factor in the history of nations has been the spirit of patriotism. Throughout the ages mighty commonwealths have been evolved, great statesmen have arisen, and world crises have been averted through a devoted people's love of country. The milestones of history have been occasions when devotion to fatherland has roused the noblest qualities in the human breast and inspired men to mighty deeds of heroic self-sacrifice. The brave Athenians triumphing over the Persian hosts at Marathon, the heroic Swiss peasants wresting liberty from Austrian oppression, William of Orange leading

his stalwart Dutch soldiers to independence from the tyranny of Spain—these immortal deeds of heroism through all time shall bear testimony to the irresistible power of a people united in common cause for liberty and justice.

But observe the other side. Parallel with this course of noble devotion to righteousness civilization has beheld the paradox of despotic conquest conducted in the name of human liberty; the impoverishment of a people through war taxes in the name of economic justice; and the wholesale slaughter of a nation's citizenship while protesting the highest welfare of the state. It has even beheld the horrifying spectacle of two mighty peoples engaged in death struggle and each fighting in the exalted name of patriotism. From barbarism, through medievalism and the Renaissance down to the present day, this conflict has persisted, till on the morning of the twentieth century over one billion men and women, as they solemnly strew the graves of departed patriots, are asking whether such travesty of justice must ever obtain between man and man.

War is a monster whose hideous character defies true conception by a people in peace. From the earliest dawn of history it has been the nightmare to the normal repose of society. In the twentieth century, as ever before, to "let loose the dogs of war" means the total suspension of social standards the products of centuries, the subversion of law and the exaltation of crime and violence.

Two thousand years ago the armored legions of imperial Rome bore their victorious arms to the confines of civilization, crushing the independence of weaker peoples, extorting tribute, and enslaving their prisoners. Less than one year ago the present Kingdom of Italy was engaged in a war characterized by greed of empire, campaign atrocities, and unprincipled disregard of justice. The campaigns of the Cæsars left Rome bankrupt, with a devitalized populace, incapable of performing the duties of citizenship. Modern Italy's imperial policy is already pointing her to a similar fate. She has brought upon herself a ruinous national debt, and a war tax so oppressive that it is annually forcing half a million of her

people to emigrate. War is still with us and it has not changed. Its horror is not diminished by increasing the distance between the combatants nor by uniforms of finer texture. It is the greater shame to an enlightened people that the marvelous achievements of man's culture should intensify the disgrace of a reversion to the brute methods of barbarism. International conflict is the paradox of civilization; its utter futility is the lesson of history; Washington denounced it as the plague of mankind, and Von Moltke declared that war costs more than it brings.

But if war costs more than it brings what defense shall society offer for the modern policy of armed peace? The rivalry in military and naval equipment is not less futile, and is causing economic wrong and social injustice little less than war itself. In this day of Christian culture every nation of first rank expends the major portion of its revenue in frenzied efforts to advance its position in military strength. Their great armaments inspire distrust of motives, produce counter preparation and react in further war expense, till the huge national debts become ominous of bankruptcy, while the relative war strength remains unchanged. Even when acquired armaments do not prevent war, when provocations arise. Napoleon's career sprang from possession of a large army, ready to act. The Franco-Prussian war resulted from mutual preparation; and Italy, restless in her armed strength seeks exercise in wars of conquest. Great armaments are the menace of peace. Yet Belgium strains her resources for military outlay while half a million oppressed workmen are forced to strike for political justice. Germany is raising her war appropriations and adding a hundred thousand more troops. France, never yet recovered from the Napoleonic wars, extends her term of army service from two to three years. Great Britain has added fifty per cent in naval expense in five years. 'Round the world this dread contagion has swept, infecting nations, both large and small, till today our own United States, without an enemy on earth, is wasting two-thirds of her national revenue for military purposes; and under the guise of preserving the peace, the world annually pays out

the mammoth sum of three billion dollars. But whence comes this enormous tribute to the insatiable Mars? From the illy-clad toilers of England, the humble homes of the Mediterranean, and the lowly peasants of North-central Europe, far removed from the glitter of military brilliance, the tax gatherer draws his levies from the shallow coffers of the poor. England has twelve millions below the poverty line who are lifting an unheeded voice of helpless protests against the inhuman system of armed peace. But the mad policies of naval construction are compelling indefinite postponement of programs of needed social reform. A peace maintained at such a cost is but a civil war where militarism triumphs over the cause of social welfare.

War and great armaments form the foulest blot upon the fair face of civilization. It is a false patriotism, a misdirected loyalty, discredited in methods and principles. It is a crime against mankind which an enlightened world opinion must not longer tolerate.

But out of the smoke of conflict, and up from the blood of battlefields, there has risen a higher patriotism which is claiming the devotion of men, a loyalty as broad as all humanity, and without discrimination of race or country. It recognizes that beneath the superficial differences of men and nations are the lasting bonds of human brotherhood, a spirit which transcends boundary lines and knows no creed, a spirit which allays distrust and inspires confidence. In its light the narrow regard for only national glory expands into world-wide interest in that truest patriotism of allegiance to mankind.

It, too, has had its heroes; great exponents of world vision—Savonarola, pleading with a corrupt Italy; John Wesley, uplifting the industrial masses and averting an English revolution; Count Tolstoi devoting a life of sacrifices for a despairing Russian peasantry—mighty champions of humanity's cause. They have sown their seeds since the dawn of the Christian Era. It is for the twentieth century to reap the harvest.

Arbitration and conciliation have demonstrated their efficiency in settling international disputes. Since the Jay Treaty pioneered the way by declaring that claims between Britain and United States should be referred to the final decision of commissioners, over five hundred questions of keen international import have been adjusted without resort to arms. The age-old controversy over the New Foundland fisheries has been satisfactorily arbitrated; Switzerland has been neutralized and undisturbed for three quarters of a century; the great territory of Louisiana has been acquired through civil purchase; and a score of South American republics have developed into free governments of free peoples without molestation or interference. The Hague court is rendering acceptable decisions on questions of the gravest character, until the great truth is being realized that "the matters in dispute between nations are nothing, the spirit which deals with them is everything."

Questions of National honor are no exception. Every dispute involves some degree of honor. In civil affairs no question is too grave for review by an impartial court, and likewise is any serious National issue safe in the just consideration of an international high court of law. Only a false standard of honor can contemplate the carnage of a field of battle waged over a justifiable dispute and then say that is peace with honor. The preference to let justice decide disputes is a far less serious indictment of a country's honor than that industrial wrong should widen the gulf between rich and poor and that thousands of children should pay the penalty of death from a lack of elementary training in sanitation and hygiene. There is but one rule of honor for men and nations. By that rule all differences may be peacefully adjusted and the carnage of war shall cease.

The Balkan conflict does not indicate the inevitability of war. It teaches that when all other peaceful methods to suppress tyranny and outrage have failed, the protection of humanity may require forceful means. It is a triumphant step toward the ultimate goal that resort to arms should be the last alternative, in adjusting difficulty. The defeat of Turkish

arms has further shown that the only legitimate object of war is the liberty of a more perfect peace, but that a continued policy of warfare must inevitably end in disaster, for out of that costly struggle a nation which has ever trusted to the barbaric practices of warfare has been finally discredited and expelled from the European community of civilized states, and there has emerged a new power whose heroic defense of humanity merits recognition by those progressive nations which are embracing the new patriotism.

With steady march the great cause of universal peace moves forward. On Christmas eve of 1914, the people of England and United States will join in celebration of a century of unbroken peace. It will mark the fulfillment of one hundred years of prosperity and progress unequaled in the annals of all history, a period which has witnessed a virile citizenship accomplishing courageous tasks for civilization. Perish the thought that only war produces heroes and that peace is effeminating! The deeds of peace are not the less heroic because less spectacular. This peaceful period has beheld a courageous army of engineers perform the greatest mechanical feat of all time in order that a canal might join the commerce of two great oceans; tireless social reformers are abolishing the curse of child labor; devoted medical experts are forcing the white plague to yield to their relentless years. These valiant deeds of peace are the more heroic because not inspired by strains of martial music, but executed in response to the call of the new patriotism.

The advance of civilization is excluding the factors of war. The industrial revolution has transformed the world into a gigantic workshop. The subdivision of labor has crossed oceans and extended to the remotest corners of the earth till all peoples are interdependent for the necessities of life. Germany receives sixty per cent of her daily food supply from the United States. The interests of nations become identical through commercial exchange made for the common preservation of life. An international credit and financial system has formed ties which war itself can not break. The failure of the bank of England would prostrate the business of all Europe.

Mere national barriers can not resist the inroads of economic needs, for the problem of daily subsistence is of more vital significance than a narrow and exclusive national pride. The great military powers must inevitably concede that peace is the normal relation of states, that the highest national good is found in complete coöperation with other nations.

But a people once roused in war passion will not consider material cost. Only in the transformed value of money in the new appreciation of the worth of human life will the problem of war be solved. There must come a wider growth of that spirit which "thinks in terms of all humanity," which sent Livingstone to darkest Africa, and today is moving the strongest nations to send their missionaries and teachers to lighten the way of the weakest; the spirit which inspired the civilized world to relieve the famine victims of India and Russia, led Europe to aid the San Francisco sufferers, and in which a world mourns the heroic death of Captain Scott, a martyr to the cause of science, on the bleak plains of the Antarctic. In the hour of adversity all men are brothers. Let us extend this spirit to times of prosperity, when Teuton and Slav, Celt and Iberian will join hands of friendship in the common interests of man, a spirit in which

"There's neither east nor west
Border nor breed nor birth
When two strong men stand face to face
Thus they come from the ends of the earth."

Herein lies the supreme work of America. Into Columbia's fair hands is committed the exalted task of ushering in the era of world peace. To her who has ever been inspired by the noblest of ideals; who is free from traditional jealousies of European states; whose shores have been a refuge to the oppressed of all lands; who through her millions of adopted sons has become the friend of every people under the gleaming stars; she whose untarnished name affords mightier defenses than multiplied armaments, the world is calling to leadership in the greatest movement of all history.

America's path of duty is clear. Her unparalleled system of schools must inculcate the heroic virtues of peace, and her marvelous public press proclaim the splendors of international friendship. It is America's sacred charge to establish confidence in neutralization and the arbitration of all international disputes; to inaugurate the gradual reduction of the world's giant armaments to an international police force. She whose patriotism showed itself at Valley Forge and Gettysburg must set the example of that loyalty even higher than devotion to country, of allegiance to mankind and patriotism to humanity.

The voice of a world-wide fraternity has risen to announce the doom of the fratricide of war and proclaim the universal brotherhood of man. The throb of the war drums grows fainter and again there rings out that clarion call of "Peace on earth, good will to men," sounded nineteen centuries ago, now calling for loyalty to duty, and for heroes of peace. Men of America, let us rise in the name of humanity, take up the task which a Divine hand has committed to the Stars and Stripes, and lead the nations into that day of universal peace, when the glow of loyalty to country is absorbed in the brilliance of the new patriotism.

PRESIDENT THWING:

The next speaker represents the State of Missouri (Applause) and I have the pleasure of presenting to you Mr. John Leo Tierney, of the St. Louis University (Applause), who will speak to you on the subject of "International Peace."

[The oration of Mr. Tierney, which won the first prize at the Missouri Oratorical Contest, is printed in the report of that contest.—Editor.]

PRESIDENT THWING:

Our next speaker of the day represents the State of Nebraska, the Nebraska Wesleyan University, Mr. J. Arthur Debardleben, who has chosen the topic, "America's Obligation."

America's Obligation

J. ARTHUR DEBARDLEBEN.

World-leadership belongs to America. She has inherited the flower of all past civilizations. Greece, with philosophy and architecture; Rome, with public law, and England with representative government, have endowed America with their respective contributions. America is the cumulative product of all past nations and, besides, she has made her own gifts to civilization, the most potent and far-reaching of which is her emphasis on the rights of the individual. She has recognized that every citizen is entitled to an opportunity for fullest self-development; nay more, she has introduced conscience into world-diplomacy. In 1865 she caused the domineering Louis Napoleon to withdraw from Mexico. In Cuba she helped the helpless. Again, at the close of the Boxer insurrection, in pure humanitarian spirit, she returned her share of the indemnity which had been imposed upon China.

In accordance with her standing as a leader, what attitude is America to take towards the great problem of the world's peace? Is she to advocate peace or is she to advocate war?

It is manifest that war is an economic calamity. A single battleship exceeds in cost the total value of all the universities of the state of Massachusetts, including even Harvard. The one serves us only for a day; the others serve us for ages. A single shot from one of the great guns of a battleship costs enough to build a home. The one results only in the destruction of life; the other establishes, nourishes, and conserves our highest ideals.

War is hell? War is worse than hell; it punishes the innocent with the guilty. The poor and the helpless, even women and children are sacrificed. And the tragedy of it is that war might be prevented.

The most just war ever waged could with greater justice have been avoided. Slavery as an American institution was indeed worse than war. Mr. Lincoln understood the South and yet recognized the justice of the demands of the North. Had Mr. Lincoln's advice been followed, no record of civil

bloodshed would now defile the pages of our history. Again, if Mr. McKinley's advice had been followed, the same result would have been achieved in Cuba without recourse to arms. Even when the purpose of war is benevolent, and the results of war for the promotion of the interests of humanity, even then is war essentially inhuman. For, the same noble ends may be attained by arbitration, and such means of attaining those ends accords with humanitarian principles.

But has not peace a positive value? What of its intellectual and spiritual significance? The church, the school, and the home, upon which American vitality depends, are paralyzed by war. In peace, the church is the place where we catch a glimpse of higher and purer ideals. In war it becomes a hospital or a fortress—is perhaps ruthlessly desecrated. In peace, the school is a hive of eager children, glad in life and love, light and sunshine. In war, it vies in its loneliness with the old dilapidated farmhouse, empty and desolate. In peace, the home is a center of loving co-operation. In war, it weeps because some loved one has returned, maimed for life; or it mourns because some loved one has gone, never to return.

Why should not the powerful United States regard the needs of its most sacred and cherished institutions and lead the world to peace?

America, more than any other nation, is free from all entangling alliance with warlike powers. Some contend that a warlike environment is beneficial. Some say that Germany's great growth is due to war; that she is the living evidence of the fact that war produces energy. Energy is displayed in time of war, it is true, but it is false, bombastic, wasteful energy. Germany's growth has been in spite of war. If, instead of consuming her resources in war, Germany had devoted herself exclusively to peaceful pursuits, who could estimate the extent of her development! In Europe the size of the fleet and of the army of each of the nations is determined by that of some rival. The fleet of England must remain one-tenth larger than the fleets of Germany and France combined; while Germany's army must be larger and

better equipped than any in the world. America, however, has no dangerous neighbors. She is far distant from all war-like powers; and hence she does not require equipment for aggressive war.

Again, America by nature is a peace-loving people. Her cosmopolitan character links her in ties of kinship to every nation of the world. Moreover, America has been more active than any other nation in promoting the cause of peace. She was among the first to realize that it is better to settle commercial differences by international agreement rather than to expend in war far more than was at stake in the beginning. Of the eighty treaties of obligatory arbitration in force among the nations, America is a party to twenty-three. In the capacity of peace-maker, America, through the efforts of Colonel Roosevelt, brought about peace between Russia and Japan. President Taft advocated an all-inclusive arbitration treaty. The Secretary of State, Mr. Bryan, seems to be continuing the same policy under the present administration. America has successfully federated half a continent, which might well make her feel in duty bound to lead in federating the whole world. Indeed, her environment, her character, and her career force upon America a natural and unmistakable obligation: she must lead in establishing universal peace.

The question arises as to how America may take the next advance step towards this end. Of course public opinion must be aroused, for in the long run any government will respond to the conscience of its citizenship. But this is not enough.

In at least one definite direction America should take the lead. I mean, the submission at The Hague of an all-inclusive arbitration treaty, a treaty providing for the submission of questions even of national honor. Such a treaty was recently signed by President Taft and by representatives of England and France. But the senate so amended the treaty that it became ineffective. Whatever the controversy, the main point for America is that she set herself right. Any nation that arbitrates must be willing to arbitrate all questions of international bearing. She must be willing to stand the consequences of upholding the law if it is right and of repealing it if it is wrong.

For example, America should not hesitate to submit to arbitration the Panama toll question. In a former treaty between England and America, it was agreed that all rates would be "just and equitable." England is dissatisfied with the remission of tolls to American shipping. America must choose the means of settling the controversy and she should be willing to arbitrate even though she is in the right. If America does consent to submit this question to arbitration, she not only leads other nations to greater confidence in her, but she acts consistently with her past career and greatly encourages the fulfillment of her hopes for the future. It has been objected that the Monroe doctrine would be endangered by the principle of arbitration. But why should it not be? The prime motive in the declaration of the Monroe doctrine was to keep the interests of Europeans separate and distinct from the interests of the Americans, and thus to preserve peace. It was but a means to a desired end. If, however, America is to advocate an all-inclusive arbitration treaty as the means of securing international peace, the Monroe doctrine will no longer be needed. Moreover, by her willingness to submit this doctrine to arbitration she demonstrates beyond denial her belief in peace—only by such an attitude can America ever convince Europe that her advocacy of international peace is free from selfish motives.

Let us suppose that America actually should follow this ideal program. For what results could we hope? All nations would ultimately follow her example. Let us conceive, if we can, society as it will be after a hundred years of world-wide peace. Let us prophesy as to some of the results and changes America's leadership and influence will have wrought. Life and wealth will be given to the development of man's highest interests; to all will be granted equality of rights; to all the desire and the opportunity for higher educational and spiritual life. Germany will rival England, not in strength of arms, but in social service. Austria and her Russian brother will be engaged in a great struggle—a struggle not in brawn and steel, but a struggle in advancing and spreading civilization. Japan will no longer be the "yellow peril." She will be the

"yellow metal" in the molding and the perfecting of the crown of civilization. There will have dawned a new world era, in which nations as one family scorn the destructiveness of battle and practice the constructiveness of statesmanship; a new era, in which "All is law, yet all is love."

PRESIDENT THWING:

The fifth orator represents the State of South Dakota, and comes from the Dakota Wesleyan University to speak on the subject, "The New Nobility."

The New Nobility

WALTER JOHN SHERMAN.

"War is hell." But the horror of war four hundred years ago was very different from the horror of war today. In former times, war was the rule and the conqueror rarely showed mercy to the conquered. Cities were laid waste, the wives and daughters of the subjugated people became the legitimate prey of the victorious soldiers. Defeated kings and generals were obliged to grace the triumph of the conqueror and seldom received either mercy or justice. Contrast the barbarous cruelty of the Spaniards in their conquest of Mexico with the magnanimous kindness of the United States in her treatment of Spanish prisoners during the late war. Imagine Admiral Cervera led in chains through the streets of Washington and put to death on the steps of the nation's capitol! Men have been learning lessons of brotherhood during the years that have come. Some influence at work upon the minds of men has eliminated the more atrocious concomitants of war. Nor is this the only hopeful change it has accomplished.

It is true that war appropriations were never so large as today, but there may be here a ray of hope. The long struggle for peace has followed essentially the same course as did the struggle for human liberty upon this continent. The anti-slavery movement was at first considered to be only a sentimental, half fanatical agitation. But the light of newer ideals

revealed slavery to be a monstrous, menacing evil, and the voice of an awakened people cried out through pulpit, press and political assembly for its overthrow. Never did the slave faction seem so strong as at the very beginning of the end. Never has the big navy craze been so powerful as in these years just passing. But already in all the colleges, brotherhoods, and societies of the civilized world, through the columns of an awakened press, in the halls and legislative assemblies, new voices are heard which translate the cry for peace from mere poetry into practical politics. This change is also luminous with hope.

Added to these, within our own memory, a successful court of international arbitration has been established. Think of the crisis in the world's history when this tribunal was founded! We read of the battles of Thermopylæ, of Tours, Hastings, Waterloo and Gettysburg, when the happiness of unborn millions hung in the balance; but here was an event vastly more decisive; a victory more brilliant, a triumph more significant than any or all of those bloody conflicts of the past. Those of us with the boldest imaginations can hardly realize how much the establishment of that tribunal meant. It meant that a new era had come. It marked the triumph of reason over brute force. It opened an entirely new phase of the peace movement. For at least, definitely and officially, the nations have undertaken the task of organizing the world. This one change, alone, is prophetic of coming peace more than all the dreadnoughts that ride the seas; for there is more significance in one single streak of gray sky in the East than in all the blackest shadows of the night.

These achievements plainly indicate that a powerful influence is behind and beneath the progress that has been made. The high hope of universal peace finds its warrant in that force which, in addition to changing the nature of war, arousing anti-military forces and establishing international justice, has given us our exalted ideals of personal character.

In the olden time every man to be a gentleman had to be a fighter, he had to carry a sword as the tool and symbol of his rank. Only a generation ago men scorned the idea that indi-

viduals could ever permanently entrust their personal safety to the peaceable judgment of others. But today all this is changed. Higher principles of life, involving the unselfish sacrifice for others, thus exalting the conduct of individuals, have given us a new nobility.

The men who receive the deepest reverence of our hearts are not those who are engaged in destroying life, but rather those who are striving to save it. Yesterday, the soldier with reeking sword aloft, the lust of battle in his eye and murder in his heart, represented the hero whom we fondly worshiped. Today we laud no such barbaric ideal. But that young husband of a frail, anæmic wife who, learning that she could be saved only by a new blood supply, voluntarily permitted his own arteries to be joined to hers and suffered his big, strong, manly heart to pump out his life till he swooned under the operation; that gamin of the street who allowed the skin from his paralyzed limb to be transferred to the blistering body of another; that engineer in the Rockies who rushed his train through the burning forest till, safely delivering the refugees from an entire village, he fell fainting from his cab,—these authenticated kings of men are the ones we love to honor, these are but examples of the heroism of the New Nobility which far outshines the glaring and futile bravery of the battle ground.

The man of the New Nobility has learned that the safety of the individual does not rest in the sword.

Therefore, if it is unreasonable for two individuals to fight, it is unreasonable for two groups of individuals to fight, and nations are only aggregations of men. Suppose you turn the hands of time backward and allow individuals to do as nations do, allow them to shape their whole conduct by the international pattern. What would happen? We would step back a thousand years. We would immediately relapse into barbarism. The mailed fist would rule. Every man would be a gun-man. Every home would be an arsenal. We would have peace, but the kind of peace that prevailed in that barbarous age when "might took the place of right, the weak were oppressed and the mighty ruled with an iron rod."

If armed neutrality continues to be the relationship of nations, it will be so only because of the failure to apply the one principle that has freed the individual. The man of the New Nobility has long ago put away that spirit of barbarism between himself and his neighbors. He is following an enlightened program.

What is our hope of raising the standard of nations from armed neutrality to universal peace? Shall we look to our boasted culture, our glorious democracy for such an uplift? Culture alone has not supremely civilized man, developed races, uplifted peoples or guided nations. Culture itself is the result of another force. Democracy alone has never led a people from the bondage of fear into a more perfect union. It is not enough that a nation, or a group of nations, be merely democratic. Democracy also is the result of another force. Universal peace can only come when the nations of earth are held under the sway of some dominant principle which they will venerate and observe. That principle must have embodied in it a dynamic, which will not only keep it living and breathing, but which will commend it to the acceptance of every man who treads the earth. That principle, if it is to uplift the standards of nations, must be the identical principle which has so profoundly exalted the character and conduct of the man of peace.

This principle is the new spirit of Christendom. He whose life and words for twenty centuries have been drawing the interest, respect and observance of ever-widening circles of men. He is the source of the dynamic whereby from the atrocious cruelties of fiendish war men have come to the happiness and hope of human brotherhood. We dare not leave His name out of this discussion. History is not a mere accidental succession of unrelated circumstances. History is unintelligible, unless read as "His-story." But many there are who do not recognize this fact. Hence they do not touch the heart of these vital issues. They deal with political policies, commercial treaties, social relationships, and international agreements, as if this world were complete in itself and had no relation to the highest court, as if the world were self-

existent, forgetting that its every law is but a manifestation of His sovereign will.

The ultimate success of the peace program does not lie in doubling the number of standing armies and floating arsenals. "He that leadeth into captivity shall go into captivity, he that killeth with the sword shall be killed with the sword." The world has witnessed the failure of many movements for the betterment of mankind which were attempted by force of arms. The great crusades of the Middle Ages revealed the inefficiency of force. Wave after wave of the bravest and best of European chivalry surged against the citadel of Zion only to be flung back by the stolid endurance of the hated Turk. From the English Channel to the City of David their bones lie scattered in the dust, while the Mohammedan crescent still waves o'er an empty sepulchre. Since that time a company of these knights of the New Nobility, without sword or battle-axe, have done more to eventually dislodge the Moslem from the Holy Land than all the hosts of mailed warriors. The consummation of universal peace will not be realized by force, but upon the higher principles of human kindness, universal brotherhood and Christian love.

The solution lies in the transformation of the individual life. The rivers of international justice can never rise higher than the fountains of individual righteousness. Nations are not the real units in the struggle for human brotherhood. The voice of any nation is but the breath of its people. The prime factor in the problem of peace is the sovereign will of each separate citizen. Uplift the man if you would exalt the nation. A man without a high ideal, without a lofty purpose stirring in his own breast, is no man; he is but an animated corpse. No system of peace can long endure if erected upon a foundation of dead men.

Today, we see in the light of the past that no great advance in one particular phase of human progress can be accomplished alone. Universal disarmament will surely come, it is but keeping pace with the great forward movement of Christian civilization. But the triumph of universal peace awaits the application of the quickening power of the Prince

of Peace to the majority of the sons of men. His influence, felt through them in the organized brotherhoods and societies, in politics and commerce, His influence, and His alone, will bring in the day of peace. The task of applying His power is our task.

Never did men face a more solemn responsibility than confronts us now. To coördinate and direct the complex forces of Christendom in its new crusade is only part of the problem. Today old nations are—whole continents of men are plastic, ready to be recast in the image of their Creator. This is the fundamental problem, the gigantic task remaining before our age. But the man of the New Nobility is not daunted in this task. He surveys all the obstacles, counts all the opponents, defies all the impossibilities and vows it shall be done. His faith, already expressed in such terms as "Universal Disarmament," "International Peace," and the "Parliament of Man" is no longer a poet's dream or prophet's fancy. With the gleam of newborn hope in his eyes, with his heart strangely warmed within him, having as his own the heritage of Luther, of Livingstone and Lincoln, this knight of the New Nobility steps forward—the true harbinger of the Prince of Peace.

PRESIDENT THWING:

I will now offer the last speaker of the afternoon, who represents the State of Texas, the Southwestern University of that State, whose subject is "From Chaos to Harmony."

From Chaos to Harmony

LEWIS J. STUCKEY.

In the beginning there was nothing in the universe but a great body of nebulous matter—a useless formation, drifting aimlessly through the infinity of space. But over this confused, unorganized mass moved the Spirit of God. Out of chaos were formed countless millions of worlds and stars. Out of confusion God made harmony, and caused all created things to sing in sweet melody.

One of our first conceptions of the Creator is the unity of the universe. This unity can but suggest that God made man to live and move like the planets and stars, in perfect harmony. Man himself, by sin, threw the world into discord. With the fall strife began, and since then brother has fought against brother, family against family, tribe against tribe, and nation against nation. Madly the world plunges into war; battles are fought, lives lost, homes ruined, nations destroyed. Strife, like a hissing serpent, strikes its venomous fangs into the vitals of civilization. The night of death hovers like a hellish pall over the world, and "The God of War" holds the sword of cruelty and vengeance, dripping with the blood of nations. But the light of a new day is breaking, and men are coming to realize that peace is the normal condition of mankind, and that war means a useless loss of life and property.

War is a great economic loss to the world. Excessive armaments are proving a crushing burden, which people are finding more and more difficult to bear. Money wasted by a nation can be as clearly perceived to impoverish a people as can the ravages of an army. Two hundred million dollars are annually spent in the United States for the army and navy. Three billion dollars have been spent by our country in pensions, and two billions are yet to be expended for wars long past. Seventy-two per cent of the income of the government is expended for past and present military needs, and only twenty-eight per cent is available for all other expenses. Vast sums are wasted for armaments which today are considered the latest triumph of science, but tomorrow are rendered obsolete by new inventions. Who can measure the loss to the nation? How much better off would our country be had these enormous sums been spent in destroying disease, irrigating the dry plains, restoring the forests, and in promoting the general welfare of the people?

War destroys life. There is a little stone on the western boundary of Russia, on which are two inscriptions. On one side is written, "Napoleon Bonaparte passed this way with four hundred and fifty thousand men," and on the opposite side is inscribed, "Napoleon Bonaparte passed this way with only

eighty thousand men." What a story of suffering this stone tells. Three hundred and seventy thousand soldiers left dead in the ice and snow of Russia—sacrificed to the selfish ambition of one man! It is estimated that, within the historic period, war has destroyed fifteen billion lives. All these lives destroyed by a process that selects the physically strong for death, and the physically weak for survival. Had nations never entered into strife, how much stronger would the human race be, and to what higher plane of civilization would it now have attained? War, the great destroyer, cares not for the aged and weak, but demands the strong young life, and deals it the death blow just at the dawn of its promise. When the great idea of universal peace triumphs over the elements of discord and trouble, this useless loss of life will cease.

War destroys property. It was a custom among the ancients to destroy the cities of the conquered. While within the last few decades few cities have suffered this fate, yet as time has passed, and science made new and more destructive inventions in arms, the ravages wrought by armies have so greatly increased that it takes years and years to recover from the effects. The United States has not yet fully recovered from the loss of property brought about by the Civil War, and if we were to have a great conflict at this time the devastation wrought by our modern engines of destruction, would be appalling. The loss of a war and the loss of life and property would be immensely greater today than ever before in the entire history of the world.

But they tell us we are to have an "armed peace"—a peace that shall be brought about by the building of powerful navies, and the amassing of vast armies. Ah! what a peace. An enforced peace—a peace of shame, of dread, of fear. The nations are in a mad race in building great navies. England desires to be the greatest peacemaker in all the world, and she determines to build a navy as large as that of any two other countries combined. Germany vows to be a greater peacemaker than England, and the United States, France, Japan, and the other countries are in this mad contest in accumulating terrible armaments—so that we may have peace!

What a display. How absurd. It is in direct opposition to the story of history, and in contradiction to reason that such enormous armies should be so persistently amassed and not be used, that such excessive navies should be built, and remain only to float idly on the ocean. Navies and armies are intended for war—not for peace, and as long as they exist they will be used for that for which they are intended. But let the nations disarm, the war clouds will roll away, and the spirit of tranquility will fill the world.

If an "armed peace" is so absurd, how will the controversies between countries be settled? Of course it is reasonable to suppose that nations will continue to have disagreements, but there is no reason why they should go to war to settle their troubles. If Texas has a dispute with Oklahoma she does not declare war on her neighbor, but goes to the United States Supreme Court to settle that controversy. Why can not nations do likewise? Power should be given to an International Court of Arbitration to settle the disagreements between countries. This court is the recognized method of finally solving this great question, it is the ideal toward which we may look and work. But before this world-wide tribunal can be effectively and permanently established the agencies now working to overcome the martial spirit must be given time to accomplish their purpose. We must not expect to accomplish in a day what it will take long years of growth to fashion. The brotherhood of man must be universally recognized, and the world must realize that the same God who rules individuals, reigns over nations. But eventually right will always triumph, and there are many forces at work which prophecy the day of peace. One of the chief of these forces is "nation-forming," which has heretofore been the outcome of necessity, a growth due alone to the circumstances of war. But within recent years men have realized that one of the most important factors in securing universal peace is the natural grouping of races according to language and territory. Until this problem is fully solved, we can neither expect war to cease, nor can we condemn men for taking up arms to secure their liberty. Russia, Turkey and the other countries that hold vast posses-

sions, and that are depriving men of their just rights may expect in the long run to be forced to give freedom to the oppressed. War will continue until the world is divided into nations symmetrical according to race, language and territory. This in time will come about as a process of evolution, and a great step will have been made toward securing the blessings of peace.

Education, also, has molded sentiment for peace in the past and will certainly continue to do so in the future. But that the school may become a still more important factor many of its ideals and teachings must be changed. The young must no longer be taught to regard the soldier as the greatest hero possible. The child must be educated to love and reverence the Stars and Stripes, not as the emblem of bloody warfare waving over advancing armies, but rather as the pledge of peace, of life of liberty. Every teacher, from the primary department to the University, should be an ambassador of world-wide peace.

The great scientific inventions made within recent years are hurrying forward the day of peace. The railroads and steamships enable men to travel into all parts of the world. The telegraph furnishes us with news from even the remotest regions of the earth, and thus the newspapers each day inform us of what has transpired throughout the world the day before. As a result we are coming to have a deep fellow-feeling for men of races and nations.

The world-wide association and fraternities are binding nations in friendship, love and truth. The stories of Jonathan and David, and The Good Samaritan are being reproduced in the lives of thousands. The Odd Fellows, Woodmen, Knights of Pythias, Masons and other brotherhoods are, by their noble principle, drawing their millions from every clime into a fellowship the ultimate purpose of which is universal peace.

But underlying these factors and more powerful than them all is Christianity, an unseen, though ever operative force, mellowing the heart of the world. For centuries the teachings of Jesus have been lifting men to a higher plane of civilization. But before we can have world-wide peace the Christian

nations must be lifted on even higher, and the story of "The Prince of Peace" must be carried into the dark places. But the kingdom is coming, light will overcome darkness, the banner of Christ will be exalted. The Angelic prophecy sung over the infant Jesus will echo throughout the world—"Peace on earth, good will to men." The sword of vengeance will forever be hidden behind the altar, and nations will discover their higher relationship, written in crimson by the blood of the cross.

Years are at hand when peace, like an infinite calm, shall rest on the souls of men; years that shall never lose their hold on peace; that shall know no shame, and no remorse, no desolation and no fear. The sun of hope rises, gilding time with the light of a golden age, and the day of peace dawns on the world like coruscations of divine fire. For he "whose dwelling is the light of setting suns," guides the destination of men to this day, "toward which the whole creation moves," when right shall triumph over wrong, harmony over chaos, and there shall be peace throughout the world.

PRESIDENT THWING:

Friends, the Committee will presently announce its decision and make the award, which consists of \$100, the gift of this, the Fourth American Peace Congress. The winner of this contest will become one of three contestants to speak at the Lake Mohonk Conference, to be held two weeks from this very afternoon.

PRESIDENT THWING:

On behalf of the Committee, I am requested to say to you that the Committee has had some difficulty in reaching a conclusion; but the Committee has reached its decision and has awarded the prize of this contest to the representative of the State of Illinois, Mr. Vernon M. Welsh, from Knox College of that State. (Applause.) With this announcement our session comes to a close.

Reception at the Wednesday Club

The personal charm in St. Louis hospitality was admirably shown by St. Louis women in the reception tendered the visiting peace delegates, including both men and women, by the Wednesday Club members at their beautiful clubrooms, Taylor avenue and Westminster place, Thursday afternoon.

Each delegate was personally looked after by some of the most prominent women of St. Louis, and introduced to other guests and hosts. Punch and tea were served to the women, and coffee to the men.

The receiving line included Mrs. William H. Elliot, president of the club; Mrs. James Harvey Hoskins, Mrs. Alfred Shapleigh, Mrs. Philip N. Moore, Mrs. W. E. Fischel, Mrs. Melville Wilkinson, Mrs. W. K. Bixby, Mrs. John Towler, Miss Nellie Richards, Miss Clara McCluney, Miss Jennie Chase, Miss Charlotte Taussig and many others. Mrs. Frederick Chamberlain was chairman of the Reception Committee.

Serving at the various tables were Mrs. Benjamin Taussig, Mrs. Edmund Sears, Mrs. Henry W. Kiel, wife of the Mayor, and a dozen others.

The Countess Spottswood-Mackin, Mrs. Elmer Black, of New York; Miss Laura Drake Gill, of Sewanee, Tenn.; Mrs. Fannie Fern Andrews, Miss Pearl Noble, of New York; Mrs. S. W. Russell, of Deadwood, S. D., and Mrs. W. T. Durbin, of Indianapolis, wife of the former Governor of Indiana, were among the women delegates present.

Congressman Richard Bartholdt and James Arbuckle had in charge several of the South American Ministers, who were shown particular attention.

Among the St. Louis women present were: Mrs. John T. Davis, Mrs. Augustus L. Abbott, Miss Amelia C. Fruchte, Miss Lucille Erskine, Mrs. Charles A. Cox, Mrs. Edith Barriger, Mrs. Asbury Walker, Mrs. Bransford Lewis, Mrs. George O. Carpenter, Mrs. Benjamin F. Gray, Jr., Mrs. Ernest R. Kroeger, Mrs. Kent Jarvis, Mrs. Festus J. Wade, Mrs. Minerva E. Carr, Dr. Frances L. Bishop, Mrs. W. R. Chivvis, Mrs.

Birney Dysart, Mrs. Percival Chubb, Mrs. H. S. Caulfield, Mrs. John O'Fallon Delaney, Mrs. Seneca N. Taylor, Mrs. Ella Goodrich, Mrs. Frederick Hattersley, Mrs. Frank P. Hays, Mrs. F. H. Ingalls, Mrs. W. E. Ingalls, Mrs. Paul Jones, Mrs. Frank Kauffman, Miss Charlotte Rumbold, Miss Edith Souther, Mrs. Harvey G. Mudd, Mrs. Edmund H. Sears, Misses Emma and Grace Taussig, Mrs. Kivas Tully and Mrs. Clarence L. Hilleary.

SECOND GENERAL SESSION

THE INEVITABILITY OF PEACE

Thursday Evening, May 1, at 8 o'clock

THE ODEON

ACTING CHANCELLOR FREDERIC A. HALL, WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY,
Presiding

PRESIDENT BARTHOLDT:

One of the pleasing features of the arrangements of this Peace Congress is the change of presiding officers. The presiding officer for this evening is Professor Frederic A. Hall, acting chancellor of Washington University. I take great pleasure in presenting him to you.

CHANCELLOR HALL:

There is, in the common acceptance of the word, a very different meaning from the word "Visions" in the word "Vision." In the one case we have the dreams, the expectation of reality, looking into the future, the possibilities of the future. In the other case we have the keen perception which seizes the ultimate issue, which plans for great results, which anticipates with the mind the things which are bound to be. In the common use of the term men do not like to be talked of as having visions. They like to have the credit of having vision, and yet, in the history of the world those things which one called visions, a subsequent generation may denominate vision. One generation attaches the word visions to the expectations of those who plan wisely for the future and whose expectations are based on things which at the present time seem unreal, and to many people impossible. Yet, in the history of the race often times a succeeding generation gives credit to those very men who are credited with having visions as being men

of vision. Tonight, as we read the papers day after day, hearing the news from the seat of war, one gets an impression that the topic of the evening is an ideal one, impossible of realization, a thing never to be attained—"The Inevitability of Peace." The present indications would seem to lead many to think that it was the inevitability of war. But, strange as it may seem, there are men and women throughout the length and breadth of this land and other lands who are said to be seeing visions. They see into the future the time of the inevitability of peace in spite of war and rumors of war, and so tonight, in our gathered capacity, we are here to talk about the inevitability of peace in the midst of war and with war threatening on every hand—to talk about it confidently, believing that with the plans which are being formed, with the public opinion that is being crystallized by such gatherings as these, by the power of the public press, there will be that consensus of opinion which will ultimately rule the world in favor of lasting peace. Our armies are going with no fife and drum, unaccompanied by the martial tread of music, but nevertheless marching on confident that the future will bring that which seems now an impossibility. Without allowing myself to enlarge upon the topic so interesting to all of us, and believing that it is not in any way the province of the chairman to anticipate what the speakers of the evening are to say, I shall bring my remarks to a close by saying it is my pleasure and honor to introduce to you Honorable Charles W. Fairbanks, a member of the Joint High British-American Commission in 1887, formerly United States Senator from Indiana, and more recently Vice-President of the United States, whose high offices of the past, the ability with which he discharged those onerous duties, his perfect familiarity with our national problems, his well-known pacific disposition, admirably fit him to begin this Second General Session of the Fourth American Peace Congress, having as a topic, the general subject of the evening, "The Inevitability of Peace," with an address upon "Our National Duty." Ladies and Gentlemen, Hon. Charles W. Fairbanks.

Our National Duty

HON. CHARLES W. FAIRBANKS.

I regret, with you, that the chairman brought his remarks so suddenly to an end. I only wish that he could have continued further, not only on my own account, but more especially upon yours. One of the most gratifying things as we look around over the world is the peace movement. There are wars and rumors of wars, and there are some who may think that the peace movement is not really accomplishing much. The fact about it is, the more wars there are the more necessity there is for the peace movement. (Applause.) They are not a sign that we should cease our efforts, but on the contrary a command that we should redouble them. The fact about it is, that during the last quarter of a century the peace movement has made decided progress, and notwithstanding wars which are in progress here and there, we are much nearer the time when the sword shall be put up than at any time since the world began. The people of the world through the marvelous instrumentalities of commerce, are brought into more intimate fellowship today than ever before. The instruments of the social and commercial interests are knitting the peoples of the world more closely together than at any time since the history of mankind began. We are so interrelated in the loom of God Almighty's purpose, we are brought into such close fellowship with each other that what concerns one country in a very considerable degree concerns every other country around the globe. The nations of the world are more interested in the questions of peace and war than ever before. The inexorable logic of events is bringing us into still closer touch with each other as the years go by and the question of peace while great today is destined to be infinitely greater tomorrow. (Applause.)

The fact about it is that war is becoming very expensive. The burdens it imposes are growing greater, not less. As one goes around the world he is struck, as he enters the ports of the greater powers, by the enormous fortifications; he is struck by the great battleships of different nations. He is amazed

at the military and naval equipment of the different countries of the world. It seems as though there should be wisdom enough in this day and generation to put an end to such waste of the energies and resources of the peoples of the world. (Applause.) The burden of war and the preparedness for war rest upon the shoulders of the great mass of people. The fact about it is, and it is a startling fact, that ten leading nations of the earth, the ten leading nations, are already expending in their war and naval equipments nearly two billions of dollars a year, a greater sum by far than was ever before imposed upon the people in the history of this world. The amount increases year by year and where is the limit? Those who in the final analysis must bear the burden are crying out, and hoping and praying for some relief. It is my judgment that relief will come through the exercise of an intelligent and patriotic judgment upon the part of each country that is concerned in this question; and that under the inspiration of our Christian civilization the sword will be put aside and some disinterested, enlightened tribunal will take the place of the battlefields of the world. (Applause.) It must be done or our Christian civilization is a failure.

The United States has become a world-power. We often hear that said in these latter years. The fact about it is, that from the foundation of time, when the foundations of the Republic were laid, the United States has been a world-power. (Applause.) And it never, Mr. Chairman, was more a world-power, never more entitled to this high dignity than in this year of grace, 1913. It has been a world-power since the days of our patriotic fathers, exercising a profound influence upon the political laws and the customs of the peoples of the world. The United States, in the last one hundred twenty-five years, has been overthrowing monarchies and shaking the foundations of absolutism the world around (applause), not by the force of her armies and her navies, but by the compelling power of her political principles and her exalted example. (Applause.)

It has been my pleasure, Mr. Chairman, in the last few years to go about the world. I went abroad in order to com-

pare conditions in other countries with those here. I went abroad in order to learn first hand the real estimation in which the United States is held in other countries, and I am proud of the fact that the farther I went and the more I studied the influence of America abroad the prouder I was of my country and my countrymen. (Applause.) The fact about it is the political principles that found expression in the immortal charter of American liberty are being incorporated more and more into the fundamental laws of all countries, no matter what their names or character. You find the principles of our constitution carried into the organic law in Japan. There are those who say that Japan wants to make war with the United States. No, there is no country beneath the vaulted heavens that wants to make war with the United States. (Applause.) There may be hot headed people here and there in other countries, we have them at home, who undertake to stir up strife with the United States, but they are the minority. They are the uninfluential element. The great body and controlling force in every country upon this globe wishes the good opinion and the regard of the United States. So in Japan. I found people in no country anywhere more covetous of the good opinion and the respect of the United States than the great body and ruling powers in the Japanese Archipelago. I have often thought that the only way to bring about the world's peace would be to eliminate a certain class of politicians. (Laughter and applause.) (A voice: Amen.) I am out of politics now and I have become bolder upon that proposition. (Laughter and applause.) And then if we could add to this list another one, and suppress or eliminate the yellow press of the country (applause), we would go far towards the establishment of the world's peace. Then if we could go a step further and eliminate or suppress those influences that want to fatten on government contracts in the event of war, that would go far toward this. So you will see by a simple system of elimination we will establish peace. (Applause.)

Go to China! When I was there the reigning power was an Emperor. Now a republic has been built upon the ruins

of the empire. It is true it is not up to our standard, but nevertheless it is a prodigious step in the right direction. While I was there only a few months ago it seemed the old dragon was rubbing his eyes; there was unrest voiced, and it was evident that a revolution was at hand, if not an evolution towards better conditions. I addressed many of the Chinese students and everywhere I went I found them eager, thirsting for information with respect to the Constitution of the United States. Everywhere they wanted to know the story of the wonderful development of liberty in the United States. They wanted to know what popular government was. They wanted to know something of the structure, the substance and form of the Constitution of the United States. What was it? American influence. Not a battle, not the power of battle-ships or armies working in the minds and the hearts and the consciousness of four hundred millions of the human race, but the immortal principles which found expression in the organic law of the United States were working a revolution in that immemorial empire. (Applause.) And I hope that the good fortune will come to the United States to be the first to recognize republican government in the great empire of China. (Applause.) China, old beyond our computation, China which was thousands of years old when the foundations of Rome were laid, and now the archæologists are hunting in the ruins of their ancient cities for some evidences of former Roman civilization. China, if she comes into the fellowship of nations as a republic will owe her advancement to the influence of the United States of America. (Applause.) I told Bro. Bartholdt to not let me talk too long.

A VOICE:

You can't talk too long. (Applause.)

MR. FAIRBANKS (continuing):

That friend there does not know me, but he thinks he does. You get an Indiana politician talking and if he does not talk too long it will not be his fault. There are others to come after me but I want to touch upon a few questions before I leave the platform.

A duty rests upon the United States, a great commanding duty. God Almighty has put great responsibility upon the United States, and nations, like individuals, must discharge their duty to their God and to mankind. No man with intelligence, no man with power for good has a right to live within himself or for himself. And no nation with supreme power such as the United States of America possesses has a right in the Providence of this world to live to herself alone. (Applause.) I do not mean that she shall go into the countries of the world with battleships and armies, with flaunting banners, to meddle in the domestic concerns of other powers. I mean this: That it is the duty of the United States, enlightened, patriotic, loving liberty her master passion, a great Christian nation, with wealth unequaled in the history of the world—it is the duty of this great nation to set an example and use her influence for the advancement and the welfare of mankind around the entire globe. (Applause.) It is the duty of the United States, my friends, to keep her international word. (Applause.)

We have heard much recently about the Panama Canal, we have heard something said about the canal tolls. A controversy has arisen between the United States and Great Britain with respect to the proper interpretation of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty. There are those, my friends, who feel that the United States is not dealing exactly fair with Great Britain, the other party to that contract, and with other international powers. Let us have a care that we make no mistake. We individuals in our small affairs may make errors and they are forgotten, but if the United States violates her plighted word solemnly made before the nations of the world, ages will come and ages will go before she can outlive it. (Applause.) It is claimed upon the part of some people that the United States is violating the policy clause of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty. Let us look into it for a few minutes. When President McKinley concluded it was time for the United States to begin the construction of a canal bringing into everlasting wedlock the two great oceans, he found standing in the way the Clayton-Bulwer treaty, a convention between the United States and Great Britain which had been

negotiated, ratified and exchanged between the two great powers half a century before. He knew that the United States must pledge her financial support to the great work of an Isthmian canal; and he knew also that it would be necessary for it to have control over the construction, the operation and the maintenance of that canal if it were to be a successful enterprise. There were those, and I remember it, Dr. Bartholdt, very well as you do, in Washington—and I am glad to see the Doctor is still there, and when he leaves Washington my faith in the Republic is going to diminish (applause); a more faithful man never held a commission in the Congress of the United States (applause), and I was almost going to say a thoroughly enlightened man because we always agreed upon questions (laughter), but my modesty forbids that; the surprising fact, I know, in that utterance is that a politician should have a conscience, but I am not speaking of Missouri politicians (laughter)—there were those who advised President McKinley to disregard the Clayton-Bulwer treaty. There were those who argued that it was obsolete, that conditions had changed in the last fifty years, that Great Britain had become interested in the Suez Canal, a competing enterprise. In short, events had worked its annulment. But President McKinley said, “No, the United States is going to make possible the dream of four centuries. It is going to undertake this work of world-wide moment and what the United States undertakes the United States will accomplish. And when that canal is dedicated to the commerce of the world it must not rest upon any broken faith of the United States of America.” (Applause.) He said, “There is only one way to go about it upon the part of a high-minded, self-respecting nation and that is to go to Great Britain and lay the facts before her and negotiate the annulment or the modification of the treaty.” How fine that sounds! No legerdemain, no finesse, straightforward, candid, Americanism which characterized President McKinley, as good a friend of peace (continued applause)—you do well to applaud that name, my friends, for ages will come and ages will go and that name will survive as one of the blessed heritages of the present generation and the future. (Applause.)

Mr. Hay, representing President McKinley, undertook the task and invited Great Britain to take up the subject of modifying or annulling the Clayton-Bulwer treaty. Great Britain acceded to the invitation and in due course the Hay-Pauncefote treaty was signed and ultimately ratified and exchanged between the powers. Under that treaty we made a certain definite statement, an important specific pledge, and in order that I may be entirely accurate I will read it as it is written, and I ask you, my friends, as I read it to see in your own minds, whether the language is so obscure that its meaning can not be correctly understood. "The canal shall be free and open"—those are the very first words in the paragraph. "—shall be free and open to the vessels of commerce or of war of all nations observing these rules on terms of entire equality so that there shall be no discrimination against any nation or its citizens or subjects in respect to the conditions or charges of traffic or otherwise." As one American citizen, one as proud of my country as you are, I want to see my Government stand by its written word. (Applause.) I do not want language written into that paragraph which shall put a stain upon the honor and integrity of our country, the first time in its illustrious career. This is familiar language to us. The whole spirit of it, the equality, the principle which is written here was carried forward from the Clayton-Bulwer treaty. I will read that. The eighth article of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty which stood as the valid convention for a half century and which was the national policy upon this question for fifty years or more reads, "It is always understood by the United States and Great Britain that the parties constructing or owning the same"—that is the canal or railway—"shall impose no other charges or conditions of traffic thereupon than the aforesaid governments shall approve of as just and equitable." Equality of authority and power as between the United States and Great Britain, and further, that the canals or railways, listen—"Shall be open to the citizens and subjects of the United States and Great Britain on equal terms," and the same equality was extended to the citizens and subjects of every other nation. The spirit of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty with respect to traffic charges was carried forward and

found expression in the Hay-Pauncefote treaty. Shall the United States decline—shall the United States indulge in subtleties and undertake to read into this plain language the reservation of a right to preferential treatment upon the part of the coastwise commerce of the United States? It is a question of honor, my friends, and a question of honor with the Republic of America is more important than all other considerations combined and put together. (Applause.) We want all of the fair advantages to which we may be entitled in trading with our neighbors, but we want nothing more. We are not an international trickster. The nations of the world from the time of the birth of our Republic until now have understood that the plighted word of the United States was a power the world over. (Applause.) I am not willing to see it go to destruction. My judgment about it is that the United States should set a high example before the nations of the world. She can not expect to hold the confidence and respect of other powers unless she respects herself and she can not respect herself in the final analysis if she consents to an act of repudiation against any power on this earth, either great or small. (Applause.)

John Hay was one of the wisest and most accomplished diplomats this country has produced. (Applause.) He was a master of his mother tongue. No one knew better than he how to use lucid and accurate English, and when he wrote these plain words in our international agreement with Great Britain he knew what they meant. He made those words express the idea of the negotiators and that was entire equality with respect to traffic charges. When the treaty was before the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate this question was debated and when the treaty came into the Senate and was open for amendment, Senator Bard of California introduced a proposed amendment to the treaty which provided expressly that the United States reserves the right to grant preferential treatment to her coastwise trade, and what was the result of the amendment? He supported it in an argument of great power—I heard him. He exhaustively considered all of the views presented now in opposition to the present interpretation of the treaty as I have given it to

you. He presented all of the considerations which could be marshaled in support of or favorable to the United States preferential treatment. But his amendment was voted down and decisively voted down. I heard it said recently by men of eminence that the reason the treaty amendment was voted down was that it was surplusage, that the treaty as it is meant it anyhow. No, that is not correct. The amendment was voted down then because in the opinion of a vast majority of the Senate of the United States it was violative of the spirit of equality which had been expressed in the Clayton-Bulwer treaty and carried into the Hay-Pauncefote treaty. That is why it was voted down. So when the treaty was ratified and exchanged between the United States and Great Britain there was no doubt in the minds of those familiar with the subject and exercising any potential influence over it—no one had any doubt whatever that the United States was included in the all-embracing, all-comprehensive language “of all nations or any nation.” “All nations” and “any nation”—the language used there is all-inclusive.

The United States is entitled to be included among “all the nations of the world” as long as she behaves herself. (Laughter.) And having been so described in language as plain as mortal man can make it the duty of the United States and those in power and control today is to live up to the letter of the compact, the letter and spirit of it.

My friends, so much for our national duty in that regard. Now, one word more and I will have concluded. We are to face a great future. No one can see far in advance of the present moment. God in his mysterious Providence veils tomorrow from our gaze and what will be the future of our country no one can see; we can only hope. I like to think of our country as the leader in the peace movement of the world. If she is to achieve her highest destiny it will be because she has exalted ideals and remains true to them. It will be because she stands by her agreement when it suits her and when it does not suit her. (Applause.) The United States must lead in the world's peace movement. Why? Because we are remote from the theater of European politics and Oriental politics. Here we stand practically isolated, no

power to fear upon this continent, no desire to enter into the domestic affairs of any other people anywhere upon this hemisphere or any other, wishing no territorial aggrandizement, coveting one thing above all others abroad, and that is the just judgment and the respect and admiration of men everywhere. The United States will not fall short of her destiny I know. The United States will not violate her plighted faith I know. There may be hours of darkness and doubt, but I understand as you do that the people of the United States in the final analysis deliberate, and when they deliberate they come to righteous conclusions. The world need have no fear of this little debate which has gone on with respect to the interpretation of our national duty; the world need have no concern of the doubts some may have entertained as to the true construction of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty; no one in the world need doubt that in the final analysis the United States will keep her word.

While I am in favor of arbitration, Mr. Chairman, I am not in favor at the present stage of the question to arbitrate this. Why? I think it is the duty of the United States to settle this plain question herself. I do not believe it is fair to force the other party to the contract, Great Britain, to an arbitration of the question that it seems to me does not admit of doubt or question. But if it should so transpire that we can not bring ourselves to that view of the question, if it should so transpire that we are not able to settle it among ourselves, then I believe that we should in all fairness, in all honesty, and with all justice to the world, including Great Britain—we should be willing to submit the proper interpretation of this instrument to the judgment of impartial high-minded men. That would be a good example. It would have a lasting influence upon the subject of arbitration everywhere if we ever get to it; but I believe in forestalling it by settling the question ourselves. And when the American people take it into their hearts and consciences to decide in the light of their duty the world may be satisfied that that duty will be discharged to the utmost.

My friends, I like to think of the United States as Senator Hoar once said—one of the most eloquent and gifted men

who ever sat in the halls of Congress—"I like to think of the United States, the genius of my country, not as the frowning, horrid fiend of war, but as the pure, white, sweet angel of peace." (Continued applause.)

CHANCELLOR HALL:

By your applause you have just expressed what might be said in appreciation of the address by our distinguished citizen.

I next have the honor to introduce to you Miss Laura Drake Gill, formerly Dean of Barnard College, now President of the Association of College Alumnae and President of the College for Women at Sewanee, Tennessee, a woman educated in America and abroad in science, who first showed her remarkable executive ability by the organization of the nurses in connection with the Spanish-American War and in the educational relief and care of the Cuban orphans, who has since risen to eminence as an administrator and educator. Very appropriately a woman has place upon a program which has to do with peace. She will speak to you upon the topic, "Some Racial Bearings of War," a subject which temperament and experience have abundantly fitted her to understand and to speak upon intelligently—Miss Laura Drake Gill.

Some Racial Bearings of War

MISS LAURA DRAKE GILL.

Throughout the Spanish-American War it was my fate to look at war from the viewpoint of the camp, the army transport, and the field hospital as a Red Cross worker. Again throughout our first Cuban occupation it was my further fate to deal at first hand with hundreds of orphan children who were so much human wreckage from guerilla warfare and Weyler's cruel edict of reconcentration.

I have used the word "fate" advisedly, because I count myself a direct product of the Civil War—born under its shadow, thrilled in childhood by its tragedies, and carrying through all the subsequent years a keen consciousness of war relationships. So definite has been the early war impress on

my general mental imagery that I have often been curious to know what contribution to the psychology of war might be made from a careful study of those of us who were born in the early sixties.

The privilege of a place in these deliberations has come, however, as I understand it, not for my war record, but for my relation to women's work. I shall therefore speak briefly of war from this viewpoint of women's work.

Women are frequently reminded that they can not be soldiers. To many minds this assertion seems to carry a less tenable corollary that war is therefore not women's affair. Is this point of view justifiable?

There are three questions which I wish to place before you tonight. Two of them I shall try to answer briefly; the third will only be answered by the unfolding of the future.

First: What is the special service which women render to society?

Second: What relation does war bear to the product of their work?

Third: How may the full fruit of their labor be spared to the nation? To take up the first question—What is the special service of women to society?

If one approaches the matter from the side of the census labor statistics, he finds somewhat over three hundred classified occupations, in all but three or four of which women are listed. This has led to frequent claims, which we shall see not to be justifiable, that women and men practically coincide in occupational activities, aims, and needs. Let us look for some of the occupational differences for men and women.

One great difference comes in the quantitative comparison. Only one-fifth of our American women ever appear in the labor lists, because unsalaried housework is not easily measurable in terms of the labor market, and is therefore excluded from reports. Moreover, these twenty per cent of women who are at some period of their lives wage earning, average earning only a little over four years—which is a very temporary service.

To go even deeper we may analyze the character of this brief service which one-fifth of our women render for less

than five years. What are these wage-earning women doing? First of all, there are large numbers of house maids and nurse maids; then we find eighty per cent of the entire teaching staff of the country; then come a large majority of all social workers; then come many women in some social phase of medicine and law. Taken all in all, from a rough estimate one can easily show over one-half of the definite wage-earning activities of American womanhood to be devoted to the physical, intellectual or social interests of youth. That is, ten per cent of women as wage-earners, and eighty per cent non-wage-earners, or a total of ninety per cent of American women are devoting themselves to the welfare of youth.

Dr. Felix Adler has probably phrased the best recent serious opinion about women's special contribution to society. He believes it to be the science of character-building for which he has coined the word "Ethology." There are many students today working out the psychological, sociological, and religious principles which ought to give, within a short time, some genuine coherence and confidence in results to this art of upbuilding character. But who has blindly felt her way towards this goal in the past and will continue to apply her fuller knowledge to the task in the future? Many agents to be sure, of which the mother and teacher are counted chief. But why should we limit our conception of women's service to the moral development of childhood when we know that fully eighty per cent of the teachers of the country are women? Must we not add mental guidance to their already granted field of ethical control?

There is also a sound body to be built up. A child's habits of diet, of dress, and of sleep are almost exclusively determined by women; also the habits of play and exercise for practically all girls and for many boys are under women's direction.

With ninety per cent of our women dealing in some way chiefly with interests of the next generation, is it too much to claim that the special service of women is the equipment of the on-coming generation in body, in mind, and in character to take its place worthily when its time comes to bear the burden of the world's work.

The second question set before us was: What relation does war bear to the product of women's work?

Did you ever hear a field hospital ward break out, so spontaneously that it was hard to know whence came the first faint sad note, into that heart-breaking song, "Oh, break the news to mother, She knows how well I love her, And tell her not to mourn for me, For I'm not going home?" You need no such heart-paralyzing experience to be reminded of the first obvious sacrifice of lives either lost by death or made ineffective by sickness and injury. These casualties wipe from women's asset the product of her bearing and rearing, or may even leave upon her heart and hands an added burden of sympathy and service. Although this loss of human efficiency is now measurable in dollars and cents to the national treasury, yet it has far less meaning to the women than other less easily measurable losses.

Her second grievance is in the handicap which war brings to her work of education. Education is pre-eminently an art of peace. But war diminishes the funds for this service; it prevents women from giving a free mind to their natural activities; and most of all it destroys the receptivity of the youth. Restlessness and hatred are twin foes to high mental or spiritual attainment.

But neither the loss of property and bereavement caused to the adult by war, nor the lack of education and confidence in others caused to the youth by a state of war, are so tragic to a thoughtful woman as the fact that her daughter will have to mate upon a lowered social plane, and cherished family tradition will be less well supported because the fatherhood of the on-coming generation has lost many of its noblest representatives.

I have seen several aged women in the South whose tragic eyes have seemed to say: "Yes, it is hard to lose those whom I loved; it is even harder to see those left to me deprived of opportunity and gracious environment; but it was hardest of all to see my daughters married to men who imperfectly share our traditions and who only came into our lives because the young men of our own circle were gone."

Whatever of added freedom shall come to women in self-development, in self-expression, in public responsibility, yet no emancipation from objective and traditional restrictions can ever remove from her the subjective and essential obligations of her nature. This nature gives to her the task of rearing a new generation. She demands for this end the opportunity inherent in financial resources now wasted in strife; the social atmosphere of respect and restraint only possible in peace; the preservation of her dearly won product from destruction.

My third question: How may the fruit of her labor be saved to the nation? I leave with you to be answered by the genius of our civilization.

So whatever our national practice regarding war may be, let us never forget that war's greatest losses are racial, and make greatest inroads upon bodies and character. In both of these respects they strike most deeply at the women of a nation.

CHANCELLOR HALL:

May I ask the indulgence of the audience for a moment in calling attention, by request, to the fact that there is in this State what is known as the Missouri Peace Society. All who are interested in furthering the objects of this great cause can help by joining this Missouri Peace Society, the expense of which is an annual due of one dollar. Your names will be received at any time during this convention.

I next have the honor of introducing to you Mr. Jenkin Lloyd Jones, during the Civil War a member of the Sixth Wisconsin Battery, Secretary of the World's Parliament of Religions in 1893 and now Director of the Abraham Lincoln Center at Chicago. The peace movement has brought prominently into view some questions which were supposed to be settled. Among them is the new analysis of what constitutes heroism. There are few men living whose broad experience, toleration and deep learning better qualify them to speak upon this new definition of heroism than this eminent clergyman, literateur, administrator, one-time soldier fighting

in the war and all the time a soldier fighting for peace. Mr. Jones will speak upon the topic, "Peace, not War, the School of Heroism."

Peace, not War, the School of Heroism

JENKIN LLOYD JONES, LL. D.

In corresponding with the committee, I said that the present contention for armament was based on two, not only false but vicious conclusions of psychology; one was that armaments contribute to peace and the other is that the preparation for war is the best school for heroism. Four years ago before this body in Chicago, some of you will remember that I offered an argument and tried to show that armament is now and always has been an irritant and a provocative of war rather than a preventive of war. Tonight I was asked to consider the psychological fallacy urged by those who would advance peace by preparing for war.

"I should hate to raise a 'sissy' boy. I rebuke my little son when he comes home with a bruised face and a torn shirt, but at the same time I secretly admire him," said a "new mother" to me recently. Though admitting all the arguments, economic, civic, social, ethical and religious, against perpetuating the barbarities of war, she yet had a lurking dread of disarmament lest there might go out of life certain heroisms and a chivalric valor so dear to a woman's heart and so essential to the life of the nation and the progress of civilization. This up-to-date mother only echoed the more open masculine protest against the peace movement which comes from certain quarters. These latest philosophers of vehemence and violence assume that a certain amount of slaughter is necessary in order to keep up the vigor of the blood and the virility of the race. Let me not overstate or misrepresent. Is it this? A certain amount of preparation for war, a certain willingness and readiness to kill innocent people on occasion, is the sign and condition of individual and national virility. It is assumed that a certain chesty strut, a disciplined swagger, a pugilistic training, is necessary in that school of valor which

makes patriots and valiant twentieth century gospelers. "Muscular Christianity" is a fetching phrase on the lips of those who would establish the field of Mars within hearing of cathedral bells, in order that the Christ may be adequately glorified and the Christian Bible be sped on its way to heathen lands, whither it must be sent, if need be, out of a cannon's mouth, and its landing-place protected by pious bayonets.

To represent an imaginary pale-faced, white-livered, nerveless product of the non-military spirit, the ill-starred and well-nigh forgotten word, "mollycoddle" has been rescued from the linguistic junk-heap. Let it be frankly admitted that drum and fife, gold lace, brass buttons, cockades and sword on thigh still stir the blood of poet and preacher, as well as of the sentimental maid who "dotes on the soldier" and lays aside her coyness in the presence of such valor. Who so fit as a soldier to guard her honor and to champion her cause! The parks, even of our pacific United States, are made resplendent with monumental bronzes of men who wore epaulettes. Even in the Statuary Hall at Washington, where each State in the Union is permitted to present in effigy two of its most famous and beloved representatives, perhaps a majority of the figures are buttoned, sashed, belted, and spurred for the fray.

Now it is growing more and more patent to the student that all this glorification of war as a school of heroism, a training-ground of the spirit, is unwarranted by history, by a profounder psychology, and a franker study of individual experience. Far be it from me to begrudge the soldier his due. I believe Ruskin is right when he says: "The disposition of human nature to honor the man with a sword arises not from the fact that he is prepared to kill, but that he is prepared to die for a cause."

With this admission, it is still true that it is much easier to die bravely than to live worthily for a cause. Many a man who has carried the bayonet with honor has disgraced himself with the ballot. There are those in this presence who with myself have followed men confidently on the battle-

line whom we distrusted and in whose ranks we would have been ashamed to be found on election day.

"So he died for his faith. That is fine—
More than most of us do.
But stay, can you add to that line
That he lived for it, too?

"It is easy to die. Men have died
For a wish or a whim—
From bravado or passion or pride.
Was it harder for him?

"But to live; every day to live out
All the truth that he dreamt,
While his friends met his conduct with doubt
And the world with contempt—

"Was it thus that he plodded ahead,
Never turning aside?
Then we'll talk of the life that he led—
Never mind how he died."

Robert Browning, in "A Soul's Tragedy," hints in terser phrase at the fine heroism which is taught in the every-day school of common life and most successfully demonstrated far from the music of drum and fife and where there are no regimental guidons to show the way. When the shout of the crowd grows nearer and nearer, the bumptious reformer and valiant champion of the people, Chiappino, exclaims:

"How the people tarry!
I can't be silent; I must speak; or sing—
How natural to sing now!"

But Eulalia, all unconscious of any valor, touched the finer heroism when she said:

"Hush and pray!
We are to die; but even I perceive
'Tis not a very hard thing so to die.
My cousin of the pale-blue tearful eyes,
Poor Cesca, suffers more from one day's life
With the stern husband; Tisbe's heart goes forth
Each evening after that wild son of hers,
To track his thoughtless footsteps through the streets;
How easy for them both to die like this!
I am not sure that I could live as they."

This is poetry and may be distrusted, but the sad prose sequel of this drama strikes a home truth and dispels the glamor of the military that has distorted the spiritual vision of men and women through the weary centuries. He, the "champion of the people," who courted the privilege of dying for them, when he found that his right to strike the decisive blow was denied him sneaked out of the Northwest gate, while the unctuous functionary says:

"Give thanks to God, the keys of the Provost's palace to me, and yourselves to profitable meditation at home! I have known four-and-twenty leaders of revolts."

Indeed not until the painted mask of war is torn off, not until the delusions of the parade ground are overcome, not until the false romance of the battlefield, where men die gladly cheering the flag, fades away, and we hear the groans and not the cheering and see the writhing of mangled forms, shall we come upon the real heroism of war itself. All honor to the captains who have moved battalions and directed campaigns, but more honor to the more numerous hosts that, uncaptured, walked their lonely beats at midnight, fighting back the forces of fatigue, and the insidious approaches of sleep. O, it is not hard to withstand a tangible "enemy," to stay where you are placed or to go where you are directed, but it is hard to stand where there is nothing to fight but discouragement, no foe but disease, no enemy but loneliness. Many a pair of knees have done valiant service in the charge that have trembled in shameful imbecility on picket. Not the enemy in the rifle-pits but famine and disease are the grimmest foes that the soldier must face. Take for this the word of a private soldier who spent three of the most precious years of his life on the firing line. Wounds and the suffering of the hospital were trifling sources of discouragement when compared with bad rations, the mud and humiliation that we had to wade through with profane and coarse companionship, and oftentimes after drinking and swaggering leaders we could not respect.

Let the heroism displayed at Vicksburg, Lookout Mountain, Gettysburg and the Wilderness be honored, but let the

highest tribute be reserved for those who successfully fought the harder battle with mosquitoes, malaria, extorting sutlers and carousing officers. He who charged the battery did well, but he who kept his tongue unsullied by coarseness and his hands free from the temptation of the dice and the whisky canteen did better. He who fought and won promotion did well, but he who held his place in the rear rank without hope of honor or dream of fame did better still. Said Margaret J. Preston,

"Only a private—it matters not
That I did my duty well,
That all through a score of battles I fought,
And then, like a soldier, fell.
The country I died for, never will heed
My unrequited claim;
And History can not record the deed,
For she never has heard my name."

The real conquerors on the battlefield and elsewhere are the self-conquerors. No armed forces like the hosts of selfishness and the divinest conquests are those which put indolence underfoot and rout the forces of idleness. These opportunities are not confined to the uniformed ranks. Many a soldier faced unflinchingly the cannon's mouth and perhaps placed his country's flag upon the enemy's rampart, but came home debauched in personal habits to trail the flag he had vindicated on the battlefield in the dust and intrigue of political and partisan trickery.

After all, we have overestimated the significance of the valor of the soldier. The hardest and highest triumphs are those won over prosperity, not over adversity; those which compel the resources of intelligence and wealth to serve the cause of humanity. Life is once and forever a battle, and there are no gains that come without struggle.

The inspiration of the man with a musket is always inferior to the inspiration of the man with a principle. Women who in war days tore their garments into lint now dare not sacrifice a single napkin of the proprieties to bandage the mangled spirits of those who go forth in search of truth and justice. Beautiful are the lives of those who decide that men

must be free from the slavery of the body, but nobler are those who valorously wage the war against spiritual slavery and moral bondage.

On Decoration Day we lay our brightest flowers on the cenotaph that represents the unmounded graves of those whose bones fertilize the soil whereon they fell. But there are always heroisms beyond the achievements of the battlefield. A South Carolina wife told me that her husband, a major in Lee's army at Appomattox, retired into the woods on hearing of the surrender, ran his sword into the ground and broke it off at the hilt. He returned to the camp with the handle only, declaring that no Yankee should ever receive his surrendered weapon. He arrived just in time to hear the terms of the capitulation, saying that "all officers would be allowed to retain their side-arms." The valor of the soldier was not equal to the exigencies of the man in this case. Not so with the resources of his great captain. The military record of Robert E. Lee as commander-in-chief of the army of the Confederacy pales in significance and power with the more heroic civic record, the post-bellum achievement of Robert E. Lee as president of a dismantled university. He scored his highest triumph when he said, "I have given four years of my life to leading the youths of Virginia to battle and to death. I want to give the remaining years of my life to teaching the youths of Virginia how to live."

No less pacific were the final triumphs of his great competitor on the battlefield. Grant's achievements as a soldier were great. His place as a field marshal is safe in the annals of war, but his proudest achievements were in the non-martial triumphs at Vicksburg when he paroled on their individual honor thirty thousand hunger-wasted private soldiers, at Appomattox when he said, "Let the soldiers keep their horses, they will need them to put in the corn," and at Mount McGregor, where he worked insistently with unflagging courage to complete that marvelous narrative that would restore the financial credit of his name and provide for his family, while the terrible cancer-scorpion was tearing his throat. It silenced his voice but it could not break the will or confine the mind.

This higher valor of Lee and Grant may be exceptional in the annals of war, but it is a commonplace in the annals of peace. That human nature is made of such heroic stuff as this is verified every day in shop and field, in home and office, in the kitchen and the schoolroom.

I once sat beside a dying soldier at Nashville while he dictated to me his last words to the wife of his bosom and the mother of his children. He grieved over the forty acres in the backwoods of Wisconsin, over which hung the threatening mortgage. He regretted that the clearing he had left was so small, "but say to her," he said, "that I hope she will be able to hold the forty. It may help raise the children." Twenty years after that, at a reunion of the "old boys," a poor, prematurely old, shabbily dressed woman sought me. Her hands were horny, her steps faltering and uncertain. She was very conscious of the old-fashioned bonnet she wore. With tearless eyes and unmusical voice she said: "I am Bradley Benson's wife. I have come to tell you that I have kept the forty, but I do not know as I have done well," and turning to the unkempt, physically robust, but mentally untrained youth by her side, she added, "This is Bradley's oldest son. He has helped me. He has been a good boy, but he has had no schooling and he feels it now." Bradley Benson's grave has a marble marker in the National Cemetery at Nashville, and on each return of Decoration Day his country's flag is renewed and flowers are laid upon his grave. Another twenty years and more have fled since I met his widow. Her body in all probability has found rest in some obscure corner of a Wisconsin graveyard, and the forty acres in the woods have probably passed into other hands. It is not likely that even a flag marks her grave, or that flowers decorate it. But I submit that the heroism of his wife makes pale the heroism of Bradley Benson, and the self-sacrifice and devotion of the boy who stood by his mother and grappled with the forest in the interest of young brothers and sisters indicates as fine and high a spirit as was ever achieved by the father.

Sixty-one thousand, three hundred and sixty-two soldiers of the northern army gave up their lives on the battlefield for the Union. Only a few more than three thousand of

them bore commissions. Bradley Benson was of the non-commissioned kind. Three hundred and eighteen thousand, eight hundred and seventy bodies are gathered into the national cemeteries guarded by the Union, nearly one-half of them occupying unnamed graves. Bradley Benson won a tombstone with a name, but the wife represents that immeasurably larger army that fought the higher battles and displayed the nobler fortitude, and that army is still full of brave women, heroic wives who bear on their shoulders the burdens of two, and are still enduring the suffering that can be relieved only by the death that comes with all too tardy feet.

Other speakers at this conference will expose the wicked waste of the material resources of the world upon the useless enginery of death. Others still will lead us in a lament over the misdirected energies of mind and body upon the arts of destruction and the costly mechanisms whose highest justification is that they will never be used. Let the lament be loud and clear until the crowned heads of Europe and the cabinets of all the republics of the world shall hear it and take note and hasten to put an end to the horrible scandal. But it is for me to protest against war and war-like attitudes, to protest against the military preparation which a sentimental and conventional philosophy, aye, even a blind and faithless Christianity, suggest and commend as peace measures. I protest because of their awful distortions of the moral perspective, the hardening of hearts and the confusion of conscience.

There is a new heroism coming that will give to the "new mother," whose words I have quoted, a confidence in the aspirations of peace and a new zeal in fostering the ideals that will bring her boy home with unmarred face and with untorn shirt because he has led a life so valiant, practiced a courage so conquering that he never had an insult to resent or an assailant to defend himself against. "Never strike first but never run away when struck. If you are in the right defend yourself," is the revised gospel of the "new mother," a type of which I met in Texas the other day. But what of the ever-increasing army of supple, bright-eyed, lithe-limbed boys and girls who so live that no indignities come, who so

conduct their lives that they need neither strike back nor run away? There are thousands of such in the public schools of America today. It is the bully that needs must defend himself. The braggart must either fight or run away. It is the man with a pistol that gets shot. He who goes armed invites danger and is specially menaced. The man who is forever guarding his honor is in danger of being entrapped into many dishonorable deeds, and the pistol carried by such a man generally goes off at the wrong time, in the wrong place, and hits the wrong person. And what is true of individuals is increasingly true of nations.

Was Jesus a sentimentalist when he said, "Blessed are the meek, for they shall inherit the earth; blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall be called the children of God?" Which of the two was the more valiant in Gethsemane, he who drew his sword and cut off Malchus' ear, or he who said, "Peter, put up thy sword?"

The poets are singing of this new heroism, a new valor that is inspiring, a new standard of courage. Rudyard Kipling, the poet laureate of the camp, the jingo singer of the British lion, broke through all the conventions and for a moment caught the true spiritual perspective when he sang of the Regimental Water Carrier:

"'E was white, clear white, inside
When he went to tend the wounded under fire!

* * * * *

"I shan't forgit the night
When I dropped be'ind the fight
With a bullet where my belt-plate should'a'been.
I was chokin' mad with thirst
An' the man that spied me first
Was our good old grinnin', gruntin' Gunga Din.
'E lifted up my head,
An' he plugged me where I bled,
An' 'e guv me 'arf a pint of water-green:

* * * * *

"'E carried me away
To where a dooli lay,
An' a bullet came and drilled the beggar clean.
'E put me safe inside,
An' just before 'e died,

'I 'ope you liked your drink,' sez Gunga Din.
 So I'll meet 'im later on
 At the place where 'e is gone—
 Where it's always double drill and no canteen;
 'E'll be squattin' on the coals
 Givin' drink to poor damned souls,
 An' I'll get a swig in hell from Gunga Din!
 Yes, Din! Din! Din!
 You Lazarushian-leather Gunga Din!
 Though I've belted you and flayed you,
 By the livin' Gawd that made you,
 You're a better man than I am, Gunga Din!"

John Hay was confidential secretary to the tender-hearted Lincoln; he was the far-seeing statesman in the chair of the Secretary of State under McKinley. He justified the confidence of these presidents by the ethical vision that made Jim Bludso the hero of the Prairie Belle when she "burnt a hole in the night:"

"Through the hot black breath of the burnin' boat
 Jim Bludso's voice was heard,
 And they all had trust in his cussedness,
 And knowed he would keep his word.
 And, sure's you're born, they all got off
 Afore the smokestacks fell—
 And Bludso's ghost went up alone
 In the smoke of the Prairie Belle.

"He weren't no saint—but at jedgment
 I'd run my chance with Jim,
 'Longside of some pious gentlemen
 That wouldn't shook hands with him.
 He seen his duty, a dead-sure thing—
 And went for it thar and then;
 And Christ ain't a going to be too hard
 On a man that died for men."

In more elegant phrase Whittier discovered the higher patriotism, revealed the inspiration which outreaches the farthest limit of camp and war, in the story of Conductor Bradley, whose "crushed and mangled frame"

"Sank with the brake he grasped just where he stood
 To do the utmost that a brave man could,
 And die, if needful, as a true man should.

"Men stooped above him; women dropped their tears
On that poor wreck beyond all hopes or fears,
Lost in the strength and glory of his years.

"What heard they? Lo! the ghastly lips of pain,
Dead to all thought save duty's moved again:
'Put out the signals for the other train!'

* * * * *

"Nay, the lost life was saved. He is not dead
Who in his record still the earth shall tread
With God's clear aureole shining round his head.
We bow as in the dust, with all our pride
Of virtue dwarfed the noble deed beside.
God give us grace to live as Bradley died!"

War the nursery of heroism? The camp the school of nobility and fortitude? The soldier the type of noble manhood? Is the soldier alone self-reliant in times of temptation, the self-elected champion of the wronged, the valorous defender of woman's honor and children's rights? All the pages of history cry out against this ethical distortion and spiritual blindness. As we climb the mount of self-sacrifice into the realm where saints dwell and saviors are discovered, we get away from the strutting peacocks of the parade, the noisy excitements of the uniformed ranks, the grim science of battleships and the awful ghastliness of war.

"A picket frozen on duty,
A mother starved for her brood,
Socrates drinking the hemlock,
And Jesus on the rood;
And millions who, humble and nameless,
The straight, hard pathway trod—
Some call it consecration,
And others call it God."

Surely Milton was right when he said, "Peace hath her victories no less renowned than war." Would you give your boy the most inspiring hero stories of today? Tell him the stories of Craig and Ross, who gave up their lives in Cuba that the ghastly yellow fever might be disarmed. Tell him of that young rector in New Orleans who, when the storm had again overflowed the cisterns and filled the streets with water, giving new life to the insidious mosquito, rallied his

forces again under the motto, "Wear a flower in your button-hole and a smile on your face and go to work again." Tell him of Billy Rugh of Gary, the poor crippled newsboy who gave the skin from his own limb to save the life of a young woman whom he had never known, the sweetheart of another. The sweetheart lived but the boy died. "Greater love hath no man than this, that he lay down his life for his friends." Tell your boy of the wireless operator in mid-ocean who flashes into space his C. Q. D. while the ship is sinking. Tell him of the "hello girl" at the switchboard in the upper story who sends the message that outspeeds Paul Revere—"The dam is broken, flee for your lives," while the devastating current is sweeping beneath her own feet. Tell your boy the story of Captain Scott, writing away with his frozen hand on the record of the brave triumph that overcame the dismal solitudes of the South Pole—writing and writing to his death. Tell your boy of that brave comrade of Commander Scott who said, "I am going to take a little walk," as he passed out of the tent, knowing he would never return, that the scanty supply might go the farther in sustaining the remnant of that brave band in the Antarctic desolation.

War itself is becoming ashamed of its goriness. Its noblest pride and justification lie in the haste with which it is seeking to ameliorate the atrocities, to eliminate the brutalities. But no refinements or ameliorations will remove the primal outrage of war and make it other than what the great general said it was—"Hell"—Hell, deep-dyed, devilish, damnable in its methods and in its effect. War is now as it always has been, ghoulish, barbaric, brutal, justified in the annals of the brute, but to be outgrown by the human. The bullet and the bayonet are the prolongations of the fang and the horn and like them they are to be outgrown or destroyed on the upper branches of the tree of life. War and barbarism are congenial comrades, but war and civilization are incompatible, and to destroy the first is the highest function of the second. You can not make hell other than it is by improving the ventilation or introducing patent dampers in the furnace.

Peace, the fostering ground for "mollycoddles?" Heaven save the mark! You need but read the daily dispatches as they have been coming from the cyclone-swept districts of Omaha and the flooded territories of Dayton and Columbus, to note that the inspirations of courage are near the fireside, on the farm, in the shop, in the study and in the laboratory, among the white-handed as well as the hard-handed men of toil.

Right never has been and never will be settled by might. Two wrongs will not make a right between nations any more than between individuals.

In Aristophanes' drama of Peace he describes Trygaeus, a rustic patriot, weary of the awful wastes of the Peloponnesian war, mounting on the back of a beetle into heaven, hoping there to find the Goddess of Peace and to invoke her service. But he found instead the fierce god of war, while Peace was confined in a dungeon beneath the feet of War, the lid held down by heavy stones. The indomitable patriot fastens a rope to the lid and tries to rally a force to lay hold of the rope, uncover the dungeon and restore Peace to her supremacy. But the gods were busy with other tasks. The spear-makers and the retailers of shields refused to lay hold because they looked for larger sales. Those who wished to be generals would not assist. The combatants fell to quarreling with each other and pulled in opposite directions. Lamachus, in full array, sought to dissuade those who would release Peace. At last, in his despair, he appealed to a band of husbandmen, and these lusty toilers of the field, humble men of the soil, laid hold and the cover was lifted and Peace was released from her confinement. The city rejoiced in the happy restoration, but the crest-makers, the makers of javelins and the sword-cutters were sullen and silent, while the sickle-makers rejoiced over the spear-makers and Trygaeus cheered the farmers, crying: "Depart as quickly as possible to the fields with your instruments of husbandry. Go without spear and sword and javelin. Go every one of you to work in the field." Having sung the paean, the chorus, speaking for the husbandmen, chants: "O day longed for by the just,

with delight I get to my vines. I find my fig trees, which a long time ago I planted."

So must we turn to the humble toilers of the field, the home-makers, the ever-diligent housewives, the mothers of men, the obscure men of science, the peaceful men of God, for that heroism that is above war, independent of its inspirations, an antidote to its devastations, an emancipator of its slaves. This higher heroism will enable even military men to sleep untroubled by fitful dreams of invading enemies pouncing upon our unsuspecting Republic some dark night from the East or from the West. For he is doubly armed who is armed with righteousness.

CHANCELLOR HALL:

I have the honor to introduce to you, ladies and gentlemen, Mr. Booker T. Washington (applause), a man who by reason of his ability and conspicuous service to humanity is the greatest living representative of his race. As a public speaker, as a writer and particularly as the organizer and eminently successful Principal of Tuskegee Institute since 1881, he has deservedly won the attention of the entire civilized world. He is the last speaker of the evening and will address you upon the topic, "Education and International Peace."

Education and International Peace

BOOKER T. WASHINGTON.

The schools and colleges have a great opportunity to make themselves felt in creating a public sentiment against war between nations. World peace will come largely through a gradual process of education of right public sentiment.

In many respects the same principles that bring about peace between individuals can be applied to nations, but it can not be done in a day; in fact, the most lasting and fundamental things are of slow growth.

Many now living can remember the time when in this country it was thought to be not disgraceful for a business man or a public man to get intoxicated or to be known as

a common drunkard. Through education of public sentiment the individual today who is known to drink to excess is excluded from business and public office in a very large measure.

It was once true in this country when the man who carried one or two pistols and perhaps a bowie knife on his body was looked upon as a brave man. Through education of public sentiment such a man today is looked upon as a coward and a coarse specimen of humanity.

It was once true in this country as well as in other countries, that the habit of dueling was countenanced and the participants were looked upon as heroes. That day has passed. If two business men in St. Louis having some disagreement on business should get out on the streets and attempt to shoot out their differences they would be disgraced in the commercial world. There is no more reason why nations should be permitted to settle their differences by the use of shot and powder than is true of individuals.

Throughout the civilized world we have learned that it is not safe to permit the two most interested parties in a dispute to settle their differences, but the differences are settled by a disinterested party. This has all come about through education of public sentiment.

Only within the last few years in our own country, I am sorry to say, it was a common habit for individuals or groups of individuals who suspected a man of committing crime to band themselves together and lynch or burn the individual without trial before a proper tribunal. Public sentiment, I am glad to say, has been brought to bear upon the disgraceful habit of lynching until we have reduced the number of lynchings in this country to less than a third or fourth of what the number was twelve or fifteen years ago; in fact, during the last four months we have only had thirteen of these disgraceful crimes against civilization as compared with twice that number a year ago.

In another respect the schools and colleges can perform an important task in bringing about international peace. The time is at hand when in all of our schools the man of peace, of industry, of scientific attainment and generosity should be

exalted in our teaching above the man of war. We must teach the youths of this country that it is just as noble for one to live for his country as it is to die for his country on the battle-field. In our schools in the present and in the future we should spend less time in teaching students the names of great battle-fields, but we should point them to the great grain fields of the world. In our school books and in our class rooms we should teach the youths of the land not so much the names of the great man killers, but the names of the great man saviors.

I believe within a few years through the education of public sentiment that the name of Mr. Andrew Carnegie will be exalted as the hero of peace as much as the name of Napoleon Bonaparte as the hero of war. Mr. Carnegie has given and is giving his life and means not in devising methods of slaying men, but in devising methods for saving men and exalting peace above war.

Through the education of public sentiment, in the future the greatness of a nation will be measured not by the tons of lead and iron and armorplate which it possesses, but by its service to the world. The greatness of nations in the future will be measured not by the number of war vessels that it floats, but by the number of schools and churches and useful industries that it keeps in existence. It will be measured not by the number of men killed, but by the number of men saved and lifted up. We must cease to judge the greatness of a nation in terms of tons, but judge it in terms of service. There is no more justification why the place of a nation should be fixed by its tons of lead and iron than there is why the greatness of an individual should be gauged by the number of pistols or daggers or bowie knives that that individual carries on his body. In the future a nation will be judged, if we do our duty in creating public sentiment, not by the number of idle men enlisted as soldiers, but by the number of its producers.

War between nations is not only wasteful in the highest degree, but brutalizing. War means destruction. Peace means construction.

It is a good deal with a nation as it is with an individual. When it once gets started in the wrong direction it is not easy to stop. Within the last ten years Great Britain has increased its expenditure on its navy from \$174,000,000 to \$222,000,000. Germany from \$47,000,000 to \$110,000,000. The United States from \$80,000,000 to \$132,000,000. Few sane men will dare question whether or not it would have been wiser to have spent this tremendous sum in the education and enlightenment of the people of these countries instead of investing it in iron and lead which will prove a body of death about the neck of these nations. A shot from one cannon can destroy in a single moment that which it has required years to create.

In the last analysis, the carrying of a pistol and gun on one's person or keeping them in his home does not protect an individual. I should be ashamed to live in a community where I depended for the safety of my life upon the use of lead and powder. The greatest protection that an individual can have is in his service to the community, and the same is true of nations.

Not many months ago I was in Denmark. As many of you know, in Denmark there is tremendous public sentiment in favor of complete disarmament, of getting rid of army and navy. When I asked the Danish people how, if they got rid of their army and navy, they meant to protect themselves, they replied that they meant to protect themselves through their service to the world; that they meant to supply Europe with a large part of its dairy and poultry products, and that in proportion as they let Europe understand that it was dependent upon them for a large part of the necessities of life that this would prove a greater protection than either army or navy could bring about.

A nation can not teach its youths to think in terms of destruction and oppression without brutalizing and blunting the tender conscience and sense of justice of the youths of that country. More and more we must learn to think not in terms of race or color or language or religion or of political boundaries, but in terms of humanity. Above all races and political boundaries there is humanity. That should be con-

sidered first ; and in proportion as we teach the youths of this country to love all races and all nations, we are rendering the highest service which education can render to the world.

For years we have been sending our missionaries to Japan to teach them Christianity, to teach Japan our methods of industry and civilization. The Japanese have learned to believe in us, have thought that we were sincere and in earnest in our endeavor to help them. But our nation is placed in an awkward position when a few thousand of the Japanese come to our country and attempt to put into practice the very lessons of economy and industry which we have taught them, and in return for this we attempt to humiliate them and degrade them as a people. Such a course is unworthy of our civilization. I pity the white man in America who is afraid to stand up in open competition in the commercial world by the side of a few thousand Japanese.

The Great Book, in whose teachings we believe, says in effect that which is temporal passes away. but that which is spiritual remains. Let us teach the youths of America that in proportion as we cling to the higher and not lower things that our nation will be made strong, useful and influential throughout the world.

THIRD GENERAL SESSION

THE PROBLEMS OF THE HAGUE CONFERENCE

Friday Morning, May 2, at 10 o'clock

THE ODEON

MR. JAMES BROWN SCOTT, Presiding

PRESIDENT BARTHOLDT:

In opening this session it becomes my pleasant duty to introduce to you as presiding officer for the meeting, Dr. James Brown Scott, former solicitor of the State Department and technical delegate of the United States to the Second Peace Conference at The Hague. His life work now is to perfect the legal machinery for the settlement peacefully of international difficulties. I take great pleasure in presenting to you Dr. Scott.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT:

It is my very great pleasure and honor to introduce as the first speaker a gentleman with whom history has been the study of his life and who in these latter years has brought his knowledge of history and power upon the great problems concerned in international peace. I refer to Professor William I. Hull, Professor of History at Swarthmore College, an institution one might say, dedicated to the cause of peace, a college of the Friends, and who wrote and published shortly after the adjournment of the Second Hague Peace Conference an admirable survey of the labors of the two conferences. In introducing to you Professor Hull and commending him to your thoughtful attention I would like, at the same time to commend to you Professor Hull's admirable little work upon the Hague Conferences. Ladies and Gentlemen, Professor Hull.

The Hague Tribunal, Its Present Meaning and Future Promise

PROFESSOR WILLIAM I. HULL.

In the first great crisis of our country's history, when the people of the thirteen original States of the American Union were called upon to accept or to reject the Constitution which was to give that Union birth, Alexander Hamilton uttered these words of solemn warning: "It has been frequently remarked that it seems to have been reserved to the people of this country to decide, by their conduct and example, the important question whether societies of men are really capable or not of establishing good government from reflection and choice, or whether they are forever destined to depend, for their political constitutions, on accident and force. A wrong election of the part we shall act may, in this view, deserve to be considered as the general misfortune of mankind."¹ The world knows how our fathers answered that question for themselves and for the world, and "brought forth on this continent a new nation, conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal."

In the second great crisis of our country's history, when the people of twenty-two of the thirty-three States were striving to maintain the Union between them all, the great champion of that Union uttered these words of solemn appeal, "that this nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom, and that government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth."

In this third crisis of our country's history, when we are standing with our fellow-members in the Family of Nations at the parting of those ways which lead respectively to Armageddon and to The Hague, it may in solemn truth be said that the conduct and example of our American Union will be decisive in the establishment and maintenance of a government of international relations, by international law, and for international justice.

¹ The Federalist, No. I.

Our own past history and the dire difficulties in which the nations of the Old World are at present involved alike summon our New World Republic—if only in gratitude to its Old World progenitors, and in gratitude to the Giver of its own abounding peace and prosperity—to seize its present opportunity, to obey its bounden duty and, bearing the ark of a new international covenant, to lead the Family of Nations within the Temple of Peace and Justice at The Hague.

It must be frankly admitted that this opportunity is not readily or widely appreciated, nor is this duty highly popular or deeply relished. When Hamilton was urging his fellow-countrymen to adopt the Constitution and the Union of the States, he sorrowfully admitted that “human affections are commonly weak in proportion to the distance or diffusiveness of their object,” and that “upon the same principle that a man is more attached to his family than to his neighborhood, to his neighborhood than to the community at large, the people of each State would be apt to feel a stronger bias towards their governments than towards the government of the Union.”¹ How much stronger would be the bias toward national governments than toward an international tribunal, could be foretold from the strength of modern patriotism. But just as the American Union sprang from “the grinding necessities of a reluctant people,” so The Hague tribunal has arisen and will be developed from the dread alternative of an international magistracy or continued and ever more terrible international war.

“The firm basis of government is justice,” said President Wilson in his remarkable inaugural of 1913; and “Justice,” said Volney, “is the fundamental and almost only virtue of social life.” Truly the majesty of the American Union is manifested chiefly, not through its armaments on land or sea, but through the medium of its Supreme Court of Justice, which now flourishes like a mighty oak at Washington; the majesty of the Family of Nations must be manifested chiefly, not through the armies, the dreadnaughts, or the airships of its “Great Powers,” but through the medium of its court of

¹ The Federalist, No. XVII.

justice which is growing up at The Hague. Even The Hague Conventions, illustrious as they are, and illustrious as they have made our era, will remain a dead letter without a court to expound them and to concentrate upon their enforcement the international public opinion which shall have been created and enlightened by its decisions.

It is as logical for the Supreme Court of each of the forty-eight States of the American Union to adjudicate the laws of the Union as it is for the Supreme Court of each of the forty-six States in the Family of Nations to adjudicate the conventions agreed upon by that family at The Hague. For the sake of consistency, for the sake of freedom from national opinions, national prejudices, national passions and interests, for the sake of international good faith, of international peace and international justice, there must be established a supreme tribunal which shall hold a master-key for all the intricacies of international law. To adopt the words of Mr. Justice Story: "Every government must, in its essence, be unsafe and unfit for a free people, where a judicial department does not exist, with powers co-extensive with those of the legislative department. Where there is no judicial department to interpret, pronounce and execute the law, to decide controversies, and to enforce rights, the government must either perish by its own imbecility, or the other departments of government must usurp its powers, for the purpose of commanding obedience, to the destruction of liberty. The will of those who govern will become under such circumstances, absolute and despotic; and it is wholly immaterial whether power is vested in a single tyrant, or in an assembly of tyrants. If that government can be truly said to be despotic and intolerable in which the law is vague and uncertain, it can not be rendered still more oppressive and more mischievous when the actual administration of justice is dependent upon caprice, or favour, upon the will of rulers,"¹ or, it may be added, upon a diversity of national interpretations. The real reason why international law seems so weak and poor in comparison with municipal or national law and is, indeed, often denied the

¹ Story's "Commentaries upon the Constitution of the United States," Ch. XXXVIII.

name of law, is not because it lacks a sufficient sanction, for the sanction of public opinion has already proved itself, here as elsewhere, sufficient; but because it has lacked a common sponsor and a common interpreter, and has been overborne and submerged in a multiplicity and confusion of national interpreters. More than three-fold condemnation attaches to the jurisdiction of the forty-six national interpreters of international law from Hamilton's axiom that "thirteen independent courts of final jurisdiction over the same causes, arising upon the same laws, is a hydra in government, from which nothing but contradiction and confusion can proceed."¹

The words of Ambassador Bryce in describing the necessity of establishing a Supreme Court in the formation of the American Union, may be applied almost precisely to the necessity of establishing an international tribunal in the development of international relations. National courts are not fitted to deal with matters of a wholly international character, such as disputes between the governments of sovereign states. They supply no truly judicial means of deciding questions between different states. They can not be trusted to do complete justice between their own sovereignty and that of another state. Being under the control of their own national governments, they might be forced to disregard any international law which their governments were desirous of evading; or even if they admitted its authority, might fail in the zeal or the power to give due effect to it. And being authorities co-ordinate with and independent of one another, with no common court of appeal placed over them to correct their errors or harmonize their views, they have interpreted and would be likely to continue to interpret international conventions in different senses, and make international law uncertain by the diversity of their decisions. These reasons point imperatively to the establishment of a new tribunal as part of the body of the new internationalism. Side by side with the forty-six different sets of national courts, whose jurisdiction under national laws and between their own citizens must be left untouched, there must continue to develop the new

¹ The Federalist, No. LXXX.

international tribunal which has already begun to spring up above the hard crust of international anarchy and chaos.¹

It is equally axiomatic that this supreme court of the nations must owe allegiance, not to any one power but to the same supreme international authority which has adopted the international conventions which the court is destined to expound and enforce. The Hague tribunal can never be, of course, supreme of itself. Its right to existence, as well as its charter of liberties, arises from the international convention which has established it, just as the Supreme Court of the United States derives its origin and its powers from the Constitution which established it; while back of the international convention lies the will of the nations, just as back of the United States Constitution lies the will of the American people. As Chief Justice Marshall finely said, in speaking of our American courts: "The judicial power has no will in any case. Judicial power, as contradistinguished from the power of the laws, has no existence. Courts are the mere instruments of the law, and can will nothing. Judicial power is never exercised for the purpose of giving effect to the will of the judge, but always for the purpose of giving effect to the will of the law."² Back of the instrument, government, looms vastly larger and more important, its creator, society; and back of the conferences and tribunal at The Hague there looms vastly larger and more important the great international society known as the Family of Nations. But this society, to preserve and promote its civilization, and to avoid falling back into the anarchy and barbarism of the rule of might, must adopt both a code of law and a judicial interpreter of it. "Whatever," said Edmund Burke, "is supreme in a state ought to have as much as possible its judicial authority so constituted as not only not to depend upon it, but in some sort to balance it. It ought to give security to its justice against its power. It ought to make its judicature as it were, something exterior to the state."³

¹ Cp. Bryce's "American Commonwealth," Ch. XXII.

² *Osborne vs. Bank of the United States*, 9 Wheat. R. 366.

³ "Reflections on the French Revolution."

The United States Supreme Court is the visible and audible conscience of the American people; the international tribunal must be the visible and audible conscience of the Family of Nations. The American people have established their Supreme Court as a barrier against their own sudden passions and uninstructed impulses; the tribunal at The Hague must serve as a bar to the doors of the Temple of Janus and preserve national liberty and international justice by confining the national dogs of war to the kennel of international law. That warfare between nations is immoral, is conceded as a self-evident truth by this Twentieth Century; and our own Supreme Court has recently decided, in its prohibition of the White Slave Trade in interstate commerce, that a right exercised in morality can not be urged to sustain a right to be exercised in immorality. By parity of reasoning it may be justly contended that the rights of nations can not fortify or sanction their wrongs; that nations have no right to commit the immorality of waging war than kings possess the right divine of ruling wrong; and that jurisdiction to prevent the immorality of warfare may be vested in a court exterior to the several nations, which shall take cognizance of wrongs committed in that twilight zone or no man's land of international relations.

It is true that the United States, like its fellow sovereignties in the Family of Nations, can not be sued in its own courts, or in the courts of the States, without its own consent; but the United States may and does give such consent, and it may sue as plaintiff in either its own or the State courts, or in the courts of a foreign country.¹

It is true, also, that the Constitution vests the judicial power of the United States in "one Supreme Court and in such inferior courts as the Congress may from time to time ordain and establish;"² and this would seem to preclude the possibility of establishing or accepting any court superior to the Supreme Court. But the XI Amendment to the Constitution provides for one important limitation of the judicial

¹ *Queen of Portugal vs. Grymes*, 7 Cl. & Fin. 66; *U. S. vs. Wagner*, L. R. 2 Ch. app. 582.

² Article III, Section 1.

power of the United States; and by amendment—perhaps even by interpretation—it may be precluded from extending to certain kinds of suits in law or equity commenced or prosecuted against the United States by the government of any foreign state; or, just as the Congress has established a Court of Claims, in which the United States is suable for certain purposes, so an international tribunal might be regarded as having received a delegated share of the jurisdiction of the United States for certain other purposes of an international character.

The jewel of Democracy, of liberty regulated by law, of self-government, is the jewel which the Constitution of the United States assigns to the Supreme Court to be kept in undiminished splendor. As the Family of Nations has grown more civilized, more stable, more closely united by economic, intellectual and moral ties, it has felt more keenly the need of national liberty being regulated by international law. And as democracy has made its way more assuredly and firmly amidst the members of the Family of Nations, the love of peace has progressed *pari passu* with the growth of self-government; for, as DeTocqueville said three-quarters of a century ago, "of all nations those most fond of peace are democratic nations."¹ It is of the very essence of the modern, democratic state to substitute law for anarchy in every domain of private, public and international life, and to provide institutions for the pronouncement and enforcement of the law. Thus, it is not only an increasingly civilized society of nations, but an increasingly democratic society of nations, which is demanding the extension of law to every part of the domain of international relations, and the establishment of an international tribunal for the purpose of giving adequate expression to it.

DeTocqueville saw behind the advance of democracy the shadow of God himself;² and in reply to the Twentieth Century's cry, "To The Hague, To The Hague," it may truly be said "God wills it!" The Palace of Peace and Justice at The Hague, whose dedication is to make this present year illus-

¹ "Democracy in America," Ch. XXII.

² "Democracy in America," Introd. Ch.

trious, shall be our Twentieth Century's fulfillment of Micah's prophecy of twenty-six centuries ago: "But in the last days it shall come to pass that the mountain of the house of the Lord shall be established in the top of the mountains, and it shall be exalted above the hills; and people shall flow into it. And many nations shall come and say, Come, and let us go up to the mountain of the Lord, and to the house of the God of Jacob; and he will teach us of his ways, and we will walk in his paths; for the law shall go forth of Zion, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem. And he shall judge many people, and rebuke strong nations afar off; and they shall beat their swords into plowshares, and their spears into pruning-hooks; nation shall not lift up a sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more. In that day, saith the Lord, I will assemble her that halteth, and I will gather her that is driven out, and her that I have afflicted; and I will make her that halted a remnant, and her that was cast off a strong nation; and the Lord shall reign over them in Mount Zion from henceforth, even forever."

That splendid prophecy has been partially realized again and again within the nations; and it should be our task to further its realization between the nations. England's inspiring experience in the substitution of law and courts for trial by battle, within her own borders, should bid her pause in her frenzied building of dreadnaughts and turn her utmost energies to the establishment of an international tribunal. Germany's melancholy history of centuries of warfare between emperor, princes, knights and cities, all of whom claimed and exercised the right of warring upon each other and thereby shrouded their common country in a pall of misery and desolation; the beneficent results of the establishment of Maximilian's Imperial Chamber and of William the First's Reichsgericht, or Imperial Court; and a precisely similar experience in France before and after the French Revolution, should lead both of those great continental powers to turn from incessant and ruinous competition in the building of armaments for earth and sea and sky, to an immediate, eager and persistent effort to substitute for them the judicial settlement of international disputes.

But it is the institution and the achievements of the Supreme Court of the United States which makes it the peculiar prerogative and the special duty of our country to lead the way in the establishment and development of the Supreme Court of the Nations. DeTocqueville, writing when our Supreme Court was not half so venerable as it is now, said that "a more imposing judiciary power was never constituted by any people. In all the civilized countries of Europe," he continues, "the Government has always shown the greatest repugnance to allow the cases to which it was itself a party to be decided by the ordinary course of justice. This repugnance naturally attains its utmost height in an absolute Government; and, on the other hand, the privileges of the courts of justice are extended with the increasing liberties of the people; but no European nation has at present held that all judicial controversies, without regard to their origin, can be decided by the judges of common law. In America this theory has been actually put in practice. In the nations of Europe the courts of justice are only called upon to try the controversies of private individuals; but the Supreme Court of the United States summons sovereign powers to its bar. When the clerk of the court advances on the steps of the tribunal, and simply says, 'The State of New York versus the State of Ohio,' it is impossible not to feel that the Court which he addresses is no ordinary body; and when it is recollected that one of those parties represents one million, and the other two million of men, one is struck by the responsibility of the seven judges whose decision is about to satisfy or to disappoint so large a number of their fellow-citizens."

Had DeTocqueville been living today, he might have selected as his illustration the State of New York with its nine millions, and Pennsylvania with its eight millions of citizens; and when it is remembered that each of these states has more inhabitants than have thirty of the forty-five members of the Family of Nations, and that only three empires in the world have more inhabitants than has the United States, the significance of this great national tribunal as a worthy prototype of the international court becomes strikingly apparent.

This great State of Missouri, with her 70,000 square miles of territory (which is more than that possessed by sixteen of the world's forty-five nations), and her three millions of inhabitants (which is more than the population of twenty of the world's forty-five nations), has bowed her head in acquiescence before the justice meted out by the United States Supreme Court on numerous occasions. For example, in her boundary dispute with Iowa as to the interpretation of an Indian treaty and the existence of certain rapids in the Des Moines River;¹ again, in her contest with Kentucky as to the ownership of Wolf Island in the Missouri River;² again, in her litigation with Nebraska as to the ownership of land which had been transferred by a freshet within a single night from the Nebraska to the Missouri side of the river;³ again, in the case of *Missouri vs. Kansas*, when an island in the Missouri River, west of its altered channel, was adjudged to belong to Kansas;⁴ and yet again, in the suit brought by Missouri against the State of Illinois to enjoin the city of Chicago from pouring its sewage through the drainage canal from Lake Michigan into the Mississippi River, to the detriment of the health of the inhabitants of Missouri.⁵

These cases, all taken from the history of your own great State, are merely illustrative of the large number of similar and even more important ones in which many of the sovereign States of the Union have participated; and the significance of this memorable jurisdiction is further accentuated by the fact that in only a few of the large number of cases have the States protested against the "interference" of the Supreme Court, and threatened to use force to resist its decisions; while these decisions have been universally acquiesced in, sooner or later, and enforced without compulsory process.⁶

¹ 7 How. 660

² 1 Wall. 395 (1870).

³ 196 U. S. 23 (1904).

⁴ 213 U. S. 78 (1908).

⁵ 180 U. S. 208; 200 U. S. 496.

⁶ Cp. an address by Hon. Henry B. Brown, Assoc. Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, retired, before the American Society for the Judicial Settlement of International Disputes, Washington, D. C., 1910.

The seven judges of the United States Supreme Court, whose responsibility excited DeTocqueville's wonder, have increased in number to nine; but the States of the Union have increased from twenty-four to forty-eight. In this particular, also, the international tribunal may derive great encouragement from our American tribunal. The question of how the equality of forty-five sovereign states could be maintained on a bench of only fifteen judges was deemed unanswerable by the Second Hague Conference; and the failure to answer it has prevented the proposed Court of Arbitral Justice from being established to this day. But when it is considered that the nine justices of our Supreme Court "represent" less than one-fifth of the forty-eight States, while the fifteen judges of the Arbitral Court would "represent" one-third of the forty-five nations; when it is considered, also, that one great Division of the United States (the West North Central Division, which includes Missouri with its three millions of inhabitants) and twelve millions of citizens are not "represented" by any of these justices; and when it is further considered that the nine States which they do "represent" include less than thirty per cent of the citizens of the United States, it becomes evident that the legislative representation for which our fathers fought is not asserted or desired in our judicial institutions.

When we turn from the geographical representation on our Supreme Court, and look at it from the point of view of nativity, we find that one-fourth of our citizens were born in other lands, and that one-half of our citizens are of foreign parentage; hence, the nine American-born and American-descended justices administer justice to a large body of citizens who have sprung from many diverse nations. Our American experience proves, then, that there could be adequate judicial representation of forty-five sovereign states of varied nationalities on a bench of only fifteen judges; and that this equality of sovereign states could be still further buttressed by a system of indirect election of the fifteen judges. For example, these judges might be chosen from nominees of each nation, by the Hague Conference, or by the 150 judges

who are members of the Permanent Court of Arbitration already established at The Hague.

The term "Hague Tribunal" is a broad one and includes two institutions which have already been established, one which is projected, and at least one which is dreamed of for the future. The institutions already established are, first, the International Prize Court, which was agreed upon in the Hague Conference of 1907 by the representatives of thirty-one out of forty-four powers (including six of the eight "Great Powers"),¹ and which has been ratified by twelve of these thirty-one powers,² but which is not destined to be put in operation except in time of war; and second, the Permanent Court of Arbitration, which was agreed upon in the Hague Conference of 1899, and which has been ratified by every member of the Family of Nations.

This so-called Permanent Court of Arbitration consists of a list of judges appointed by the various powers, not more than four judges to be appointed by each power. It is provided with a Permanent Administrative Council, composed of the diplomatic representatives accredited to The Hague, and an International Bureau, both of which bodies are designed to facilitate a resort to, and the work of, the Court. The judges of the Court all reside in their own countries, of course, and act as judges or arbitrators only when three or five of their number are chosen by two powers in dispute to form an Arbitral Tribunal to arbitrate the dispute. Thirteen of these arbitral tribunals have been formed since 1902, and they have given their decisions on twelve disputes. All of the "Great Powers," except Austria-Hungary, have submitted one or more disputes to these tribunals, and the decision has been acquiesced in without difficulty in every case. Some of these disputes, like those between the United States and

¹ The thirteen powers which did not sign the convention were: Brazil, China, Dominican Republic, Greece, Japan, Luxemburg, Montenegro, Nicaragua, the Netherlands, Roumania, Russia, Servia and Venezuela.

² The twelve powers which have ratified it are: United States, Chile, Cuba, Ecuador, Guatemala, Haiti, Mexico, Persia, Salvador, Siam, Turkey and Uruguay.

Great Britain over the North Atlantic Fisheries, and between France and Germany over the Casablanca Deserters, have been of long and exasperating continuance or of great military menace.

In view of the remarkable success with which this Permanent Court of Arbitration, by means of its arbitral tribunals, has met during only ten years of operation, it is urged, on the one hand, that we should let well enough alone and strive, not so much to improve upon the character of the Court, as to enlarge its jurisdiction. This may be done by securing either a world-treaty, or treaties between pairs of nations, which shall submit every dispute, or at least every justiciable dispute between nations to the jurisdiction of The Hague tribunal. This was the object of the epoch-making General Treaties of Arbitration which President Taft negotiated in 1911 with Great Britain and France, but which were, most unfortunately, not ratified by the Senate. The great feature of these treaties was the provision of a Joint High Commission which should decide whether or not a dispute is "justiciable" (that is, capable of being decided by law or equity), and if so, should submit it immediately to The Hague tribunal. This great development of the tribunal's jurisdiction must assuredly be taken up again and pressed to a successful conclusion by the present administration either at or before the third Hague Conference. And it will undoubtedly be found by the Joint High Commissions, when they once get into successful operation, that all disputes between nations are "justiciable," and that none of them need be settled by force of arms, any more than disputes between individuals need to be settled by the duel.

On the other hand, it is urged that the Permanent Court of Arbitration is defective in various particulars, and that side by side with it there should be established the Court of Arbitral Justice, which was agreed upon at the Hague Conference of 1907, but which has not yet been constituted because of the demand that each of forty-five nations shall appoint one judge to a bench which, it is universally admitted, should not have more than fifteen judges. This court, it is claimed, can be truly permanent; that is, it can be composed

of judges who shall reside in or near The Hague, and be always ready to try a case, and who shall serve for a term of years and try all the cases which shall arise during that term, instead of disbanding, as is the case with the arbitral tribunals of the so-called Permanent Court, as soon as the one case assigned to them is tried. This permanency, it is also claimed, will give rise to greater dignity, consistency and the force of precedent, and enable the court to become a fount of international law and justice broadening down from precedent unto precedent. Again, it is claimed, the proposed Court will prevent the decision of grave international controversies by the vote of a single umpire, as is possible in the arbitral tribunals of the Permanent Court when two judges appointed by one of the nations in dispute vote in favor of that nation, and two judges appointed by the other nation in dispute vote in favor of that nation, thus leaving the deciding vote to be cast by the single umpire, who is really the only unbiased judge on the tribunal. These arguments have much weight, and it is quite probable that the conversion of the existing Permanent Court into the proposed Court of Arbitral Justice, or the establishment of the two side by side, would induce the nations to refer more of their controversies to arbitration than would be the case when the Permanent Court alone exists.

This hopeful development of arbitration should also be striven for by the present administration. And if the United States by pointing to its own experience can convince the world that equality of judicial representation does not necessitate absolute numerical or geographical equality of representation, there are various ways by which the problem of fifteen judges to represent forty-five nations can be solved. One suggestion is that three or five of the "Great Powers," say the United States, Great Britain, France, Germany and Russia, should establish the Court by the appointment of three judges each, and that the other nations should then be invited to recognize the Court and participate in the selection of judges by some equitable method to be agreed upon by the five Great Powers before the Court is constituted. This suggestion has back of it the encouraging precedent of

the eleven States whose people organized the American Union in 1789, by the adoption of a Constitution which permitted new States to become members of the Union and to receive absolute equality of representation in the legislative and executive departments of the national government and virtual equality of representation in the judiciary. Some of the New England States were opposed to this feature of the Constitution, which they regarded as unduly generous to the new States, but every vestige of such opposition has faded away and been almost forgotten; while the eagerness of the new States to join the Union, even without absolute equality of judicial representation is a familiar fact of American history. It is interesting and encouraging, also, to find that of the nine justices of the Supreme Court, only four come from the original eleven or thirteen States, while the Chief Justice and four of his associates come from the new States; and yet the question of "representation" is scarcely raised by either the old States or the new and is regarded of no judicial significance whatever.

If the steps outlined above can be taken by or before the third Hague Conference, they will mark another extraordinary development of The Hague tribunal; and perhaps this is the greatest advance to which the present generation should aspire. But in this happy dawn of the Twentieth Century, when the horizon of the future looms vast and clear, we have already caught a vision, beyond the Permanent Court of Arbitration and the Court of Arbitral Justice, of still a third Hague tribunal, which shall possess all the strength and none of the weaknesses of its predecessors. This Supreme Court of the United States of the World shall have all the permanence, all the power and prestige of precedent, and all the judicially representative character which have made the Supreme Court of the United States of America so illustrious; it shall possess as broad and complete a jurisdiction within its domain of law as does its American prototype, and by the adjudication of all disputes between nations it shall forever banish international warfare from the realm of men; and it shall be, not an arbitral tribunal, like its two predecessors, the Permanent Court of Arbitration and the Court of Arbitral

Justice, content with a compromise between two extreme demands, but a truly judicial tribunal, striving toward and ever more nearly approximating the heights of ideal justice. To attain this destiny, its judges must cease to be representative of the nations, who are the suitors before the Court, and must become truly representative of the Family of Nations, by whom the Court is created and for whose life, liberty and pursuit of happiness it is destined to labor. Even as the nine citizens of Louisiana, New York, and seven other States of the American Union, who have been elevated to the Supreme Court of the United States, have been merged completely in the larger and fuller citizenship of America, and look out from their exalted bench in the Capitol at Washington, seeing not their fellow-citizens of Louisiana, New York, and the rest, but their fellow-citizens of America; so shall the fifteen judges of the Supreme Court of the United States of the World look out from their seats in the Peace Palace at The Hague and recognize no national boundaries, but see only their fellow-citizens of the Family of Nations, their common humanity, to whom justice must be administered and international peace conserved.

The day of the attainment of this vision is not yet; but the world has caught sight of it, and will never relinquish the quest for its attainment until it becomes a glorious reality. While, then, we strive to develop the Hague tribunal of today and to perfect its details, our efforts must be consciously shaped by the ultimate ideal, even as the sculptor sees in the rough block of marble beneath his hand the heavenly image which is to arise from it; or as the political philosopher and statesman sees through the mists of local prejudice and persistent anarchy the image of the noble Republic which is to be. We Americans especially, as we stand in imagination before the Temple or Palace of Peace in The Hague, which is destined to enshrine this great tribunal, may well recall the golden words which have been attributed to Washington as he stood on the threshold of the Constitutional Convention in Philadelphia: "It is too probable," he is said to have exclaimed, "that no plan we propose will be adopted. Perhaps another dreadful conflict is to be sustained. If, to please

the people, we offer what we ourselves disapprove, how can we afterward defend our work? Let us raise a standard to which the wise and honest can repair; the event is in the hand of God."

In the gladsome light which a century and a quarter of experience with our Constitution, and especially with our Supreme Court, sheds upon us, we may well be more assured of success in our international experiment than Washington and his colleagues could be with their national experiment in the dark days of 1787. But we must clearly see and frankly face the foes of the new internationalism, as they did the foes of the new union; and, as they utilized the Federal Convention in Philadelphia to achieve the victory of union, so we must utilize the Third Peace Conference at The Hague to achieve the triumph of international justice. We must see to it, in the first place, that that Conference shall establish an international agreement to restrict the monstrous growth of armaments on land and sea and in the air, which constitute today the prime cause of the militarism still rampant in our civilization, and which, worst of all, constitute the chief obstacle to the establishment and use of the most efficient judicial means of settling international disputes. We must see to it, in the second place, that that Conference shall start into beneficent operation the great second step in the development of an international tribunal, namely, the Court of Arbitral Justice. And we must see to it, in the third place, that that Conference shall adopt a world-treaty of obligatory arbitration, including all justiciable disputes between nations and providing for an International High Commission, or an International Grand Jury, which shall decide as to the justiciability of those disputes and indict or present them before the international court. By these three means, shall the present promise of The Hague tribunal be greatly realized, and International Peace through International Justice be made possible, prepared for, organized and assured.

This, then, must be the proud task and the undying glory of our country, to lead the world along the path of international justice up to the doors of a Supreme Court of the Nations. Senator Elihu Root has expressed his belief that

"our people here in the United States are probably more ready to assent to such a view as this than the people of any other country in the world, because we have been long accustomed to the existence of a great tribunal, a part of whose duty it is to sit upon the question whether the governments of the sovereign States, and the government of our own nation, in their acts, conform to the great principles of justice and right conduct embodied in our Constitution. "That arrangement," he continues, "of embodying the eternal principles of justice in a written instrument, investing a court with the power to declare all acts of congresses, and legislatures, and presidents and governors, void and of no effect when they fail to conform to those principles, is, it seems to me, the greatest contribution of America to the political science of the world."¹

Noblesse oblige. Unto whomsoever much is given, of him shall much be required; and to whom men have committed much, of him they will ask more. Shall not we, who have inherited the blessings of representative government, which our Teutonic ancestors wrought out in the forests of Germany and in the townships of England; shall not we, who have inherited the blessings of representative government bulwarked by the decisions of a supreme court of justice, which our American forefathers bestowed upon our infant republic, and which has proved one of the prime causes of its growth and strength; shall not we strive our utmost to endow the world—the entire Family of Nations—with a supreme tribunal which shall supplement the representative assembly that is taking form in the conferences at The Hague, and shall make it thoroughly effective for international justice and international peace? No more illustrious gift than this could be bestowed upon the nations, and none is more peculiarly appropriate to our government of the people, by justice, and for the general welfare of mankind.

During the summer of 1913 there is to be dedicated at The Hague that strong and beautiful Palace of Peace which is to shelter within its walls the youthful beginnings of the

¹ Address before the American Society for the Judicial Settlement of International Disputes, Washington, D. C., 1910.

world-republic. To that Palace the nations of the world, our own included, have contributed of their substance, their materials of construction and ornamentation, and thus have made it an embodiment of the international good will and the organization of international law and justice which have illumined the dawn of the Twentieth Century. There is no nobler, more fitting gift which our Republic can bestow upon this palace than an international supreme court; and, as a visible expression of its spirit and aims, there might well be erected within its court-room a statue of William Penn, that first American who prophesied and advocated it for the nations, and who first put its principle of peace through justice into successful operation in a great American commonwealth.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT:

It is my very great pleasure, ladies and gentlemen, to introduce as your next speaker a gentleman who has made the study of political science his life work. He has developed, enlarged and ennobled the conceptions of the study by travel and as delegate of the United States to the Third Pan-American Conference at Rio de Janeiro, and to the Fourth Pan-American Conference at Buenos Ayres. He has obtained a right to address you as the result of such diplomatic experience, sure and certain that the projects he discusses and lays before you are feasible, tested by the theory of political science, by the practice of diplomacy. Ladies and Gentlemen, Paul S. Reinsch, of the University of Wisconsin.

The Active Promotion of Industrial Peace as a Primary Policy of the United States

PROFESSOR PAUL S. REINSCH.

The people and Government of the United States stand before the world as the principal representatives of orderly international arrangements and the peaceful settlement of international disputes. This position has been gained during the period since the first Hague Conference through the able

and active support of these principles by our delegations at The Hague. It is not generally recognized abroad how deeply this policy of international peace is rooted in the traditions of our national life. Every important policy that our nation has stood for in its external relations has had peace and a peaceful development of national enterprise for its basis. This is true of the Monroe policy, of the Open Door, of our abstention from European entanglements, and also especially of our relations with our most powerful neighbor, Great Britain. This great policy of the United States is not born of a passing sentiment or enthusiasm, but is connected with the fundamental conditions of our American life.

People in Europe are indeed often skeptical of the real purpose of the United States in advancing this great international policy. This skepticism can be overcome and our position of leadership vindicated only by having our policy in every detail conform to those principles which we advocate before others. No single thing would weaken the position of American leadership, our reputation for national sincerity, more than if we should, for instance, refuse to arbitrate or to settle in some other satisfactory manner the question of the Panama tolls. Nature has given us an advantage of position beyond any European or Asiatic nation. Our freedom from constraint and from besetting rivalries makes it easier for our nation to follow the policy of humanity than for any other, but we should soon lose the advantage which this position affords if, while preaching a policy consonant with the orderly development of humanity, we should be disregarding it ourselves, as soon as minor profits could be made by following an opposite course.

Upon our action, upon our self-restraint and sense of justice, in dealing with such matters as the Panama tolls, the policy of commercial equity known as the Open Door, the treatment of aliens within our limits—our international credit depends. They will determine the extent and power of our influence at the next Hague Conference. This third Conference, following upon an era of war, when international animosities have been sharpened, will have an even more difficult task than its predecessors. Its success depends in

no small measure upon the influence which the United States, as a neutral, disinterested, humane power, will be able to exert in pointing out the way to peaceable improvements. There are three directions indicated for the constructive work of the next conference. The American proposal of having the Tribunal transformed into a permanent court will be taken up again. The American Department of State has already indicated the purpose of advancing the practice of peaceful settlement by prevailing upon the nations to agree to give every controversy an impartial investigation before proceeding to hostilities. Then a great task awaits this, or some succeeding, conference in the near future in providing a general constitution or organization for all those international activities which have grown up during the last few decades, and have taken the form of public international unions. These already cover a great part of the administrative activities of states, such as communication, police, sanitation, weights and measures, industrial and literary property, in all of which nations find it impossible to get along without mutual assistance.

Those who realize how intimately the American ideals of international action are connected with the spirit of our institutions, how deeply they are rooted in our national life, will hope that these relations may be thoroughly understood by the European nations whom we are endeavoring to influence in the direction of our own aspirations. Our policy is not based on sentiment; it is the outgrowth of our national destiny, it is inevitable, and not a matter of choice for us. Yet frequently we allow our own government and ourselves to stand in the way of its realization, we permit the life principles of our commonwealth to be lowered to the character of impotent generalities, half veiling the play of petty interests. Our national policy must be seen as a whole in order that we may realize how seriously the achievement of our main purpose is often jeopardized by yielding to unimportant interests and to importunities of the moment.

How far is the policy of advancing international peace the true policy of the United States, aside from mere sentimental ideals? I need not do anything but review for you

certain facts in our historical development which make this policy not only necessary, not only natural, but inevitable. Every primary domestic policy, every most important element in the structure of our institutions points in this direction. What are the most essential elements of our policy? The fact that we are a federal nation; the fact that with us law—the respect for laws, laws administered by the tribunals—are the essential elements in the state; the fact that we are a nation composed of many diverse racial elements; the fact that we have had only one very important war and that a civil war; the fact that we are the primary power on the American continent and are associated with other nations who are living upon the same principles. I need not go into these matters in detail. It would take too much time and our time is short, but I will surely have your support in this: That if you were to describe the essential feature of American government to foreigners, you would say it lies in the importance of adjudication, or the readiness to submit the most important controversy to judicial determination, to the fact that we believe in the natural organic development of law from generation to generation. When we transpose this idea to world politics we are not building in the air; we are not consulting a vague sentiment; we are taking the heart of our experience as a nation and applying it to broader relations; we can not see how the world can fail to be benefited when we consider the benefits which we have derived from this policy.

New York and Pennsylvania are just as rich and powerful as many independent nations. Think of the conditions we should be living in in this country, if these states had been formed into nations and were confronting each other with armaments. We have escaped all of that through the institution of our Federal Government with its Judiciary. None of these states with all of its vital interests and its honor is in any way endangered by submitting to that tribunal.

I need not refer to the matter of our mixed population, a population composed of very many elements. We have through them come to realize that racial antipathies do not stand in the way of forming a common national spirit, a spirit of co-operation in all the work of a civilized state. But think

for a minute of our relations to our American neighbors and the implications of that spirit upon our policy of peace. The first great arbitration treaty of universal scope was adopted by the Pan-American Conference of 1890 in which the American powers were represented. This treaty was not ratified but it has stood in the history of arbitration as a model, and it has stood more as an indication of what American policy is in these matters. There is a famous saying of a great general who had in a war laid down certain conditions, a certain ultimatum. He was victorious. After the victory his opponent sent messengers and asked him what he now demanded. He said, "Victory gives no rights, our demands before and after victory are the same." That is the true American principle which is believed in by every American nation, and if that is true, if war of itself can give no rights, then what a very cumbersome outworn fashion of ascertaining right is the appeal to war! So we are supported in this policy by the common judgment and common feeling of our American neighbors. We are by nature endowed with great wealth, physical power, numbers, which gives us a position of primacy. It gives us the position which renders our action more significant than if we were acting for ourselves alone. We are acting as the representatives not only of our policy, but of that of entire America, and we can carry out that policy.

America is the representative of all that is connected with popular government. We have often had indications of that in other countries. In Europe, in Germany, it was mentioned yesterday, the people are looking to the United States. They have a hope that the United States, in its policy at least, will stand for those things which are rational, that are inspired by common-sense, that are inspired by the love of humanity. When we look at our own careers we are certain that the influence which has been most helpful in our development is the appeal to the judgment of friends, often older friends. When we had won their approval we were happy and satisfied. There could be no success that would outweigh this approval on their part. Now, the United States has innumerable friends of that kind in Europe, in Asia and in

South America. Just the other day I had a letter from Germany in which my correspondent said, "I read the noble state papers of President Wilson. It is uplifting to think that a statesman in the present age of our year 1913 can advocate such policies." Our action is watched in a spirit of hope and a spirit of admiration. On the other hand, of course, there are those who are skeptical, who say that the United States is pursuing these policies simply in order to gain advantage and to veil the true nature of its diplomacy.

We have had appeals on this floor for the Navy League. I do not desire to oppose that organization, but it only occurs to me to make this suggestion. Certainly the part of the national income which is now being devoted to such matters is very great and it ought to be amply sufficient. I can not have any sympathy with any demand for greater military expenditures. (Applause.) We have an army. We have a navy. If these organizations should concentrate their energy and attention upon making this army and this navy as perfect, as honest, as fine an instrument as exists in the world, then I could understand their striving. But as you well know, the administration of these, especially of the army, is not at all on a basis of efficiency.

It was stated that the preparation for war is the secret means of avoiding it. We are yesterday and today witnessing in Europe a state of tension that is being brought to a climax. Every one here knows that if there is a great war in Europe today it is due to armaments. (Applause.) It is due to the fact that these tremendous organizations are such a burden upon the European population that they will say, "Let us at last have war and be through with it." A very weak point of the advocacy of war at the present time is this: it can never go on—it can never succeed without the misrepresentation of the motives and purposes of other nations. (Applause.) One of the most active advocates of increased armaments, Mr. Hobson, years ago prophesied that within two years or eighteen months of that time there must be a war between United States and Japan. He imputed to the Japanese nation the purpose of making war and at one time staked his reputation upon it. It is true at the present time his influence in

Congress is somewhat diminished on account of so often crying war. But what was the next thing when there happened to be no Japanese war scare available! The next best scare was that proceeding from Germany. You remember that in the debates in Congress those who advocated the increase of armament held up Germany as a threatening danger to the United States, entirely forgetting that even if Germany should desire such a policy it could not at the present time afford to send even a single vessel for hostile purposes to America. Some nation must be held up as an enemy. Now, that I consider very bad. There is only one thing worse and that is as bad as murder—spending money in large amounts for the purpose of stirring up hatred, on the part of those who profit from the furnishing of war material. (Applause.) I think that the revelations that have come out in Germany, with respect to the expenditures of the Krupp firm in France, to stir up French nationalism, will do more to prevent a war than anything else and yet that is going on all of the time. When I was in South America, in Argentina, the European furnishers of arms were conducting a concerted campaign to make Argentina believe that the Brazilians were anxious to make war against them. Are we then as a nation, as individuals, in the condition of a bull that is being led into the Spanish fighting ring, not quite ready to go ahead but having the fiery barbs shoved into our living flesh? That seems to be necessary in every case where the proposal is brought forward to increase armaments.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT:

I have in my hand a telegram, just received, extending greetings and best wishes from the Peace and Arbitration Committee of Colorado of the Women's Christian Temperance Union signed by Mrs. Ruth H. Sprague.

The next speaker needs no introduction. In all matters of civic and international righteousness his name is as familiar as a household word. It is, therefore, my very great pleasure, and I repeat, my very great honor, to introduce to you Mr. Edwin D. Mead, who will speak upon the "Pan-Teutonic Pledge of Peace."

The Pan-Teutonic Pledge of Peace

EDWIN D. MEAD.

Professor Hull called our attention at the beginning of his interesting paper to the fact that the founders of the American Republic had a profound consciousness of the significance of their great experiment for the peace and welfare of the world. And Professor Reinsch had developed in a remarkable, illuminating way the fact that our Republic is pledged to the great work of promoting the peace of the world by the very conditions of its own federal organization. All that the world needs in order to be the kind of organized world that we want is to understand international affairs—those great principles of interstate commercial freedom, of an interstate supreme court and of interstate federation which have proven so beneficent in the operation of this federal Republic. Now, it was not simply the founders of this Republic who at the time were conscious of the great significance of the work which they were founding, it was also in the consciousness of the thinkers of the old world.

Just after the American Republic had been launched, Immanuel Kant, the greatest of German and of modern philosophers, published his famous tractate on "Eternal Peace." It was in some respects the most remarkable prophecy and program ever made of an organized and peaceful world. It was published in 1795, during Washington's administration, during the French Revolution, and a few years after the American Revolution, in whose success Kant had taken such great satisfaction and with the inspiring principles of which he was in such profound sympathy. In his great tractate he boldly identified the cause with the cause of self-government; and it would almost seem as if he had the new American Republic in mind when he wrote: "If happy circumstances bring it about that a powerful and enlightened people form themselves into a republic—which by its very nature must be disposed in favor of perpetual peace—this will furnish a center of federative union for other States to attach themselves to, and thus to secure the conditions of liberty among all States, according to the idea of the right of nations,

and such a union would extend wider and wider in the course of time, by the addition of further connections of this kind." As he believed that the primary condition of universal peace must be predominant self-government in the world, so he believed that the course toward it must be the course of political publicity—and he inveighed against secret treaties as sharply as the peace party in France, with so much reason, has been inveighing against them the present year.

Immanuel Kant was not the only illustrious German whose sympathies were with us in the Revolution. The admiration of Frederick for Washington is well known, Hessians were hired to fight us—that was the day of mercenary soldiers—but Steuben and DeKalb came voluntarily to help us, and their service was conspicuous. If self-government must come before peace comes on a large scale, then it was fitting that the American sent to Berlin to represent us in 1911 at the dedication of the Steuben statue there should have been Richard Bartholdt, the champion of peace, the president of the American group of the Interparliamentary Union, and the president of this National Peace Congress in St. Louis.

While we remember the Germans whose sympathies and whose hands were with us in our struggle for independence, we do not forget that our very map is dotted all over with towns whose very names—Chatham, Pittsfield, Foxboro, Conway, Grafton, Wilkes-Barre—are memorials of the great Englishmen who were with us also, fighting as valiantly for us in Parliament as our fathers fought at Bunker Hill and Trenton.

The German element in the United States at the time of the Revolution was already large, and it has gone on becoming larger and larger, and has long been the second element in our population. If Professor Faust's analysis is right ("The German Element in the United States," II, 27), of our total white population in 1900 of 67,000,000, there were 20,000,000 of English blood, 18,000,000 of German blood, 14,000,000 of Scotch and Irish blood, with the balance of other national stock; and while the numbers were greater in the last census, the relations of those of English and German descent

did not probably vary greatly. It is a surprise to many to know that the number of Americans whose roots are in the mother country is not much greater than those whose roots are in the fatherland. There are states like Wisconsin two-thirds of whose people are of German blood, and great cities like Milwaukee, Chicago and St. Louis more German than English. This so strongly German city, where this Peace Congress meets, is indeed a fitting place for any theme. The German inspiration of William T. Harris and his associates, who gave this city an illustrious fame in philosophy, I can not forget. New York is the fifth German city in the world. Three-fifths of our total white population, and these the determining factor, are English and German. The United States is essentially a Teutonic nation.

The services of German-Americans in our Civil War, in our politics, our literature, our journalism, our music, our education, in every field of our American life, have been so conspicuous that it is almost invidious to single out any German name for praise.

Two eminent names are at this time being emphasized anew for us by impressive commemorations. In April, Senator Root devoted his presidential address at the annual meeting of our American Society of International Law to recalling the signal international services of Francis Lieber, whose famous code of regulations of war, prepared at the request of our government during the Civil War, had been promulgated on the April day in 1863, just fifty years before Senator Root's commemorative address. That humane and almost revolutionary code was in its field epoch-making; and so complete was it that when, a generation later, the first Hague Conference approached the subject, the enlightened laws of war which it adopted were little more than a repetition and endorsement of Lieber's memorable code. In his student days in Berlin, Lieber had been thrown into prison for his poems of freedom; he had gone, as Byron went, to fight for the liberties of Greece; and it was for liberty that he came to America, beginning in Boston the illustrious career which was also identified with South Carolina College and with Columbia College in New York, at which last place he

prepared his famous "Code of War for the Government and the Armies of the United States in the Field."

In this month of May, on Morningside Heights, New York, at this very time that New York will be welcoming the British delegation on the commemoration of the century of peace, and within speaking distance of Columbia University where Lieber's Code was prepared, there will be dedicated a statue of Carl Schurz, who, like Lieber, paying in a German prison in his youth the penalty of his love of liberty, came like him to the United States for liberty and for that great career as scholar, journalist, soldier and statesman, which belongs among the proud possessions of our last generation. I do not need to remind you of his close association with this city of St. Louis. He stood for the highest ideals in our public life. "The stars are what we must sail by" was his answer to him who asked why he would strive for ideals that were distant as the stars. He loved liberty and he loved mankind, and to both devotions the Morningside memorial pays tribute together. Stirred always by the highest in German idealism, his definition of American citizenship was the highest; and he felt the cardinal duty of his adopted country to be the leadership of the nations away from the hoary old war system to international justice and peace. At the great International Arbitration Conference at Washington in 1896, his was the most eloquent and impressive word. "As an American citizen," he said, "I can not contemplate this noble peace mission of my country without a thrill of pride; and I must confess that it touches me like an attack upon the dignity of this republic when I hear Americans repudiate that peace mission upon the ground of supposed interests of the United States, requiring for their protection or furtherance preparation for warlike action and the incitement of a fighting spirit among our people."

The obligations of our own higher scholarship to the universities of Germany have been incalculable. The first American who visited a German university was Benjamin Franklin, by interesting coincidence precisely he among the founders of the republic whose impeachments of the war system were most constant and emphatic. It was in 1766 that

Franklin attended a meeting of the Royal Society of Science in Gottingen, then but a generation old as a university; and it was to Gottingen that the first illustrious group of American students went half a century later, the advance guard of the great army of American students, numbering thousands, who have been to Gottingen, Leipsic and Berlin and the other seats of German learning during the century which followed. Edward Everett, George Ticknor, George Bancroft, and Joseph Cogswell constituted the distinguished pioneer American group at Gottingen, the first two going in 1815; and Bancroft was the first American to take a German university degree. By eloquent coincidence, it was this first American graduate of a German university who became half a century later the first American ambassador to the new German empire. There have been years in the last century when in all the German universities together there have been at once nearly a thousand American students, nearly half a thousand in Berlin alone; and the thousands of American scholars now occupying teaching posts in our higher schools and universities, whose culture and training were so largely gained in Germany, and who love the German people, are a potent pledge, added to our great German population, that between these two great nations at least there shall always be good understanding and good-will.

In the present noteworthy international movement among the students of the world, which movement has created the Cosmopolitan Clubs in thirty of our American universities and multitudes of similar organizations in other lands, it is a significant and grateful fact that the new International Clubs in many of the German universities were the result of American initiative; and few things are doing more to promote fraternity and mutual respect in the world of scholars than the exchange professorships established by Germany and the United States. Out of this movement has grown the Amerika-Institut at Berlin, that splendid library placing at the service of German scholars and students all that throws best light upon the life, history and institutions of the United States. It were to be wished that there were just such a German institute in New York, and especially one in London. What

England chiefly needs today is that close familiarity with Germany which exists between German and American scholars. From the Scotch universities many students have gone in the last century to perfect their training in Germany, but from the English universities but few have gone—and the neglect has been at cost. I was present in 1909 at the fifth centennial of the University of Leipsic, my own German university; and to a group of Scotch professors, who had also studied there, I lamented the mischievous misunderstanding of Germany at the time in Great Britain, with the resulting strain. "Do not say Britain," they exclaimed: "say England. There is no thoughtful man north of the Tweed who shares the feeling. We Scotchmen count it simply a fit of the English sillies." The word threw light at once upon the geography and one considerable ground of the periodical panic in the United Kingdom about a German "invasion."

I wish that, at this approaching centennial of the beginning of the great procession of American students to Germany, there might be founded at Berlin a practical memorial in the form of a German-American House, to meet the social and intellectual needs of the now great American body in the German capital, to become a rallying point for Germans and Americans, to become a center of international enlightenment, to contain the necessary library and conference rooms bearing the names of Bancroft, Everett and the illustrious pioneers, and especially a hall bearing the name of Immanuel Kant. The building should be called the Andrew D. White Memorial, in honor of the great scholar, now our international Nestor, who has through the long years done so much for German-American friendship, who rendered America and the world such conspicuous service as our ambassador to Berlin, and who went from that high post for the time to lead our American delegation at the first Hague Conference.

There is nothing more imperative, there could be nothing more beneficial and potential, at the present international juncture, than the best understanding and the closest co-operation between these three great Teutonic nations, Germany, Great Britain and the United States; and this co-operation it is especially within the power of the people of the United

States, whose ancestral roots are chiefly and almost equally in the mother country and the fatherland, to bring about. The United States is by no means simply New England and New Germany. It is also New Ireland, New France, New Italy, New Russia—New York, with its million Jews, being surely the New Jerusalem; and in international things all peoples are responsible together. In the United States the predominant responsibility is with the predominant elements, the great Teutonic elements, of the nation.

This is the hour for action. By startling fatality, it is precisely these three nations, called by every circumstance of their history and character to be the leaders of civilization, who are today the three conspicuous sinners, contributing most, as the three great naval powers, to the mad rivalry which menaces and exhausts the nations. We hail the signs that the strain of these last years between Great Britain and Germany is at last becoming less severe; and we welcome such plain speech and strong appeals as those in the recent address of the First Lord of the British Admiralty, addressed so particularly and pointedly to Germany, in behalf of reason and reform. The United States does not need to wait and should not wait for German and British action to inaugurate a movement for the arrest and reduction of armaments; and we rejoice in the strong words of our Secretary of State impressing upon our people, safest of peoples, their paramount duty to begin the performance of the urgent duty for which the world waits.

In the supplanting of the system of war and armed peace by international neighborhood, no step is now more urgent than the united pledge of the nations for the immunity of ocean commerce in war; and it is a significant fact that the first treaty in history pledging this between two nations was that between the United States and the Prussia of Frederick the Great, in 1785.

This is a significant and eloquent time in the life of these three Teutonic nations. Germany commemorates the present year the centennial of the victory of Leipsic, which finally freed her from Napoleon and launched her permanently upon her freedom. Great Britain and the United States commem-

orate next year the centennial of their hundred years of peace. The new life of Germany which began a hundred years ago, with men like Fichte and Stein, was chiefly signalized by the wonderful reconstruction of her education, which has proved the great secret of her advance and power. It is for the three nations to make this centennial time the inauguration of a great new period of international advance and education, an orderly and peaceful era for mankind.

It is very common for men to talk about the Kaiser as the "war lord;" but as a matter of fact there is no other great nation which has so faithfully kept the peace, not only during the last twenty-five years, but during the more than forty years since the Franco-Prussian war, as Germany. While she may be open to fair criticism for maintaining an army too great and developing a navy too great—and I think that both have now become far more a menace than a defense—there is no other country in Europe which has equal justification for its great armaments, by reason of her position in Europe and her relations with the great powers on both sides of her. During this long period, moreover, her armaments have practically served only defensive ends. Every other great power has meantime been in war, Great Britain and the United States in peculiarly wanton and wicked wars; but Germany, barring the unworthy collisions with the native races in West Africa, has kept out of war. Let this be remembered to her credit and the credit of her Emperor.

There has been a long strain between Germany and England, for which the fault has not been chiefly Germany's. Happily that strain seems at the moment much relieved. Statesmen and men of business on both sides come at last to see clearly that hostility is foolish and futile, that war would be wild, and that each prospers most in the other's prosperity. The United States is on the eve of celebrating a centennial of peace with Great Britain. With Germany she has always been at peace. This is therefore a propitious time to consider the potentiality of these three great Teutonic nations for the peace of the world, if they will unitedly assume the leadership which the interests of civilization at this pregnant hour demand.

When William II became Emperor of Germany in 1888, it was with the declaration that the cause of his country's peace was sacred to him. "When I came to the throne," he said at Bremen half a dozen years ago, "I swore that I would do my utmost to keep at rest the bayonet and the cannon;" and the twenty-five years' record shows how faithfully the pledge has been kept. "I only wish," he said at Düsseldorf in 1891, "that the peace of Europe lay in my hands; I should certainly take care that it never again is broken." In the same year he spoke to the same effect at the Guildhall in London; and at the reception given him at the Guildhall in 1907, referring to his address at the earlier reception there, he emphasized anew his controlling desire. "I said then, on this spot, that my aim was above all the maintenance of peace. History, I venture to hope, will do me justice, in that I have pursued this aim unswervingly ever since. The main prop and pledge for the peace of the world is the maintenance of the good relations between our two countries, and I will further strengthen them so far as lies in my power. The German nation's wishes coincide with mine."

The proudest title of the King who in that year 1907 reigned in England was "Edward, the Peacemaker;" and King George V today is no less sincerely devoted to the cause of the world's peace, which was the chief aim and object of his father's life.

This too is surely the chief aim and object of the President of the United States today, as it was the chief aim and object of his predecessor. And the chief need and demand of the great world today is that these three commanding Teutonic nations should unite in broader policies than any in the yesterdays for the permanent peace and better organization of the world.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT:

May I ask you to remain seated just one moment. During the delivery of Mr. Mead's address which I was unwilling to interrupt a copy of a telegram was handed to me which I believe you will receive with the greatest of interest and I

deem it a very great pleasure and a very great honor to communicate it to you.

The United States of which we are so proud has just this morning formally recognized the Republic of China. (Great applause.)

A VOICE:

The best news I ever heard.

Chairman Scott, Mr. Carnegie, President Bartholdt, Mr. Brookings, and others on the platform, conferred. The following telegram of congratulation was proposed to the delegates, unanimously adopted and sent:

To the President of the Chinese Republic at Peking:

The Fourth American Peace Congress in session at St. Louis, composed of representative and peace-loving citizens of America, congratulate the Chinese Republic upon its formal recognition by its sister Republic of the United States, wishing it a future even more illustrious than its past.

To this greeting the following cordial answer was received following the adjournment of the Congress:

American Peace Congress, St. Louis:

President Yuan, after reading your telegram, instructs us to thank you, and to wish you enjoy prosperity.

President's Secretary.

THE MISSOURI PEACE SOCIETY

SECOND ANNUAL MEETING

Friday Afternoon, May 2, at 2 o'clock

JEFFERSON HOTEL, COMMITTEE ROOM

PRESIDENT RICHARD BARTHOLDT, Presiding

SECRETARY HUDSON:

In the absence of Mr. Bartholdt I will call the Second Annual Meeting of the Missouri Peace Society to order. We are fortunate indeed in having such a large attendance at the meeting. We are fortunate also in having a number of guests who are attending the meetings of the Fourth American Peace Congress, and we are extremely fortunate in having with us as one of our honored guests this afternoon, the Executive Director of the American Peace Society. I have asked Mr. Call, Mr. Arthur Deerin Call, the Executive Director of the American Peace Society, to speak to us this afternoon on the work of a state peace society. There is no person in the United States better qualified to speak on this subject. There is no person whose business it is so primarily just now as Mr. Call's. We are extremely glad, therefore, to welcome Mr. Call, and I am sure the society will enjoy his address. (Applause.)

The Work of a State Peace Society

ARTHUR DEERIN CALL.

I have discovered that one of the great weaknesses of every reform movement is that it is based upon emotion and sentiment. I am primarily interested, therefore, in spreading before you certain facts with reference to the work for peace in the field as I have been able to gather them from the different societies. It occurs to me that you, being a state peace society, will be interested in knowing what the facts are with

reference to the work in the field. I have studied twenty-one peace societies since last September with as much care as I can. I find that they are in substantial accord so far as their aims are concerned. I find, for example, that they agree that the aim of the state peace society is to promote the active co-operation of the agencies working for international fraternity and that on the largest possible scale. I find that they are also substantially in accord that the aim of the state peace society is to extend the education of the people in the cause of peace and the prevention of war. There is also accord that the aim of the state peace society is to facilitate the establishment of a world order on the basis of justice and international law, of the known principles of economy and the established lessons of history. I find that they are also in agreement that the aim of the state peace society is to carry on this work as vigorously, as effectively and as scientifically as possible. There are some divergencies from these aims but not material divergencies. The Peace Society of California, for example, emphasizes in addition to these four aims, the aims of killing the Japanese war bogey. The New York Peace Society adds that it looks to its membership of men and women who are willing to work towards its ends however widely they may differ as to measures and methods and adds, "This society does not oppose such armament as may be adequate for national protection." The Pennsylvania Society emphasizes the limitations of armament by agreement. As I am able to find it, those are the aims of the state peace societies.

Now, the questions relating to the organization of the peace societies, such matters as the officials, for example, the meetings, the finances, surely those are the practical questions. I find that three of the societies have honorary presidents. The number of vice-presidents varies from one to thirty-one. One society reports twenty-seven honorary vice-presidents; another binds one hundred twenty-four vice-presidents with sixty other members into an advisory council. One has a council of sixty-five. All the societies have secretaries. The boards of directors number eight to thirty.

[Mr. Call then read extracts from his report as Executive Director of the American Peace Society to the Board of Directors. This very interesting report is given entire in the "Conference on Organization for the Promotion of International Peace."]

The financing, that is the annual membership fee, is fixed by the societies with one exception at one dollar. I will say here that since this report was written, within the last few weeks, one society has increased its fee to five dollars. Those are the facts as I have been able to gather them. The application of them to the Missouri Peace Society I should think would be something likened to this. It will be important that you continue in the good work which you have already begun. It is important that you look upon this as an educational organization. It is a fact that every time one of those thirteen-inch guns is fired off enough money goes up in smoke to build a comfortable home; three times enough money has gone up in smoke to have paid every expense of a college education. Just think of that.

The money that is put into one of those battleships is impressive. The money put into one of those battleships would build a dozen Washington monuments. It would build six union stations in the City of Washington. It would build two Congressional Library buildings. It would give a college education to twenty-four thousand persons. It would give a trade to 75,000 persons. It would buy all the land and build all the buildings of Harvard University, of Tuskegee and Hampton Institutes thrown in. It would build a six-foot channel from St. Louis to St. Paul. It would build a thousand locomotives. It would run the schools of a city of a hundred thousand inhabitants for a quarter of a century. These things are impressive in terms of dollars and cents.

But I have discovered that while it is important that we know these facts, and while it is important that our state peace societies should educate their members in these facts, after all the financial argument does not seem to be the very serious argument. The peoples of all history have been perfectly willing to sacrifice any amount of money in a crisis. I submit

that the function of a state peace society is to educate its people in something still more important than the financial aspects of the problem. I submit that we must spread the notion that the great fact of all life is that there may be more life. I take it that is the great lesson of history for us all. That your struggle here and mine is that there may be more life. I submit that the great teaching of Jesus was, the greatest teaching of Jesus, was, "I came that they might have life and that more abundantly." The institutions of war are inconsistent with this great principle. I can not go into the horrors of war. There is a book just translated from the German which does that. It does it in such a way that you can not talk about it. You can only read it. The greatest one of the educational functions of the state peace society is to educate the people in what has already been accomplished for the promotion of international peace. They may well become acquainted with the work of the Interparliamentary Union, for example, with thirty-six hundred members, the President of the American group being your distinguished president, the Hon. Richard Bartholdt. You can well afford to educate your members in the work of the Hague Conferences, those two great facts on the pages of history. You can educate your friends in what has been accomplished by the great international conferences already held. Beginning in the year 1815, for example, coming down through all the years until last year we found that there were over thirteen hundred international organizations, and that there were over one hundred and thirty international conferences last year. The world is coming together. We are coming to realize more and more that we are brothers of one another. The real work of the state peace societies, as I see it, is the education of its people in these great facts. (Applause.)

PRESIDENT BARTHOLDT:

I am gratified more than I can express in words that we have such a numerously attended meeting of the Missouri Peace Society. I think the outcome of this Congress should be one of the strongest, most enthusiastic and most virile

state organizations that exist in the United States today in behalf of international peace. I am just full of enthusiasm in favor of the cause and should like to speak to you for an hour but our time is short and we have to stick to the program. I call, therefore, upon the secretary, Professor Hudson, to make the report of officers. I want to say to you that so far the Missouri Peace Society has existed in a president on paper, which is myself, and several other officers, but the real society has existed in the person of Professor Manley O. Hudson. This does not mean that Mr. Hudson was the only one who had an interest in the matter. If there had been any divergence of opinion, if there had been any fault to be found with what he did, there would have been more than one in the society, but the fact that he acted for the whole organization is proof positive that he did right, that he acted in accordance and in harmony with the conscience and sentiments of the whole organization. Mr. Hudson. (Applause.)

Annual Report of the Secretary

PROFESSOR MANLEY O. HUDSON.

I want to say, in reply to the remarks of the chairman, that I should consider it extremely unfortunate if any society was dependent upon one or a few persons. The Missouri Peace Society is more fortunate, however. I am very glad to say that it depends upon a great number of persons as you will see from reading over the list of officers of this society. By way of introducing the report of the secretary, I will say to you that the Missouri Peace Society was organized as a branch of the American Peace Society at the City Club in St. Louis, on October 21, 1912.

Immediately after the organization of the society, a membership campaign was begun. Folders were printed and sent all over the state, and memberships were solicited by personal letters and by circulars. The result of this campaign to date: The Society has 112 annual members, four adhering members, one sustaining member, two contributing members, two life members. A section of the society, organized at Columbia, Missouri, has forty-two members. The membership campaign

has taken a good deal of time and is, of course, a never-ceasing activity of the society.

The secretary has written numerous letters to the ministers of the state and to various religious and other newspapers in an effort to secure a state-wide observance of Peace Sunday in December.

In December, 1912, numerous churches responded to this appeal. In Columbia, Centralia, Cape Girardeau, Carthage, Savannah and St. Joseph, mass meetings of citizens were held at the instigation of the society, and addressed by officers of the society. The secretary addressed one meeting in Kansas City, and another mass meeting in Centralia. Numerous pastors over the state informed the secretary that their sermons would be devoted to peace on this day.

The secretary has co-operated with Mrs. Josephine H. Greenwood, the secretary of the American School Peace League, in purchasing and distributing copies of the Peace Bulletin issued by the United States Department of Education, to the school teachers and in the securing of the observance of Peace Day, May 18th, in the public schools. Efforts have also been made to bring peace speakers to the various colleges and universities of the state, and the secretary has, on several occasions, addressed college students.

To facilitate this work, the secretary keeps on hand a supply of peace literature, secured from the American Peace Society, the World Peace Foundation, the American Association of International Law and similar organizations, and such literature has been sent out in response to numerous calls for it.

The secretary has made a determined effort to induce the various managers of Missouri Chautauquas to book peace speakers on their programs during the summer of 1913. It was too late after the organization of the society to do very much along this line, but it is a promising field for the future work of the society, and the efforts will be renewed for the summer of 1914. Though it will have little effect in directly increasing the membership of the society, it is believed that there is no better way to encourage the public opinion out

over the state than through appeals made from chautauqua platforms. The secretary is of the opinion that if necessary the society may well afford to employ a competent speaker for such work.

The secretary has established a speakers' bureau and has asked several people to allow their names to be listed as competent and willing to speak on the subject of international peace upon demand. The replies to such requests have been encouraging. It is believed that such a bureau ought to be extensively advertised and such speakers used as much as possible. The president of the society has agreed during the coming year to make a speaking tour of the state in the interest of the work of the society. During the last two months the secretary planned such tours for Mr. Arthur D. Call, the Executive Director of the American Peace Society, and Mr. Edwin D. Mead, the Director of the World Peace Foundation. But for imperative reasons these tours were abandoned.

The secretary has served as the chairman of the Missouri Committee of the Intercollegiate Peace Society, and in this capacity has succeeded in arranging oratorical contests at Central College, St. Louis University, The University of Missouri, Washington University, Westminster College and Wm. Jewell College. The winners of these various local contests met in St. Louis on April 29th for a State contest, the winner in which represented the State in an interstate contest on May 1st. The society has gone to some expense in encouraging these contests by offering prizes and paying the expenses of the contestants. Much enthusiasm has been manifested in the various colleges and able young men have been enlisted in the work for the cause of international peace as a result.

On March 29th, Mr. Robert S. Brookings, of St. Louis, was elected the society's representative director of the American Peace Society.

The officers of the society, including the secretary, have actively co-operated in the organizations of the Fourth American Peace Congress, and were influential in bringing it to St. Louis, the president of the society being the president of the

Congress. The society is represented at the Fourth American Peace Congress by delegates in addition to those of its members who are serving on the committees of the Congress. It is believed that the membership of the society will be materially increased as a result of the impetus given the work in this State by this Congress, and the officers of the society have made plans to take advantage of this opportunity.

PRESIDENT BARTHOLDT :

You have heard the report. I think the proper way to proceed would be for a motion to receive it.

[Thereupon it was duly moved and seconded that the report be received. Motion unanimously carried.]

PRESIDENT BARTHOLDT :

While we are all together here, we Missourians, I would like to call your attention to something which in my judgment is of great importance. I suppose that in all state organizations for peace this same matter ought to be brought up. It is the question of the ratification by the Senate of treaties in favor of arbitration. It so happens that both of the Senators from Missouri voted against the ratification of the arbitration treaties proposed by the late administration. I do not speak out of school when I say here this is a public matter of very great importance, that I appealed to both Senators, argued the case with them, tried to show that if this country proposed to enter into any treaty of arbitration with any other country or with the world we will have to make the same amount of concession that the other country makes to us. In other words, as President Taft expressed it, "We can't eat the cake and have it, too." But somehow these gentlemen could not see it in that way. It is possibly, I say possibly, due to the fact that there was not sufficient public sentiment behind the question. These gentlemen had not heard from their constituents at home.

If we want to prevent our country becoming a nation that is being pointed to from all sides of the globe as lagging behind and as being not even as far advanced on this question as the military powers of Europe are, it is necessary for us

to bring influence to bear on the United States Senate. What better method could there be than that the citizens of each state organize for the purpose of bringing influence to bear on their own Senators. Now, I want it understood here that this question has absolutely nothing to do with partisan politics. In my advocacy of international peace I have never distinguished between a Democrat and Republican or any one else. I brought this matter up merely for the purpose of suggesting that when the next question of that kind comes up—and it will come up in connection with the proposition of Mr. Bryan which will involve the negotiations of a new treaty with the great countries of the world—that all of you who really have the cause of international amity and justice and peace at heart take just sufficient time for the purpose of writing a letter to your Senator in Washington telling him you are heartily in favor of such a national policy. That is all.

Now, the purpose of Mr. Bryan that I mention is this: In 1905 I had the honor of presenting to the conference of the Interparliamentary Union at Brussels a model arbitration treaty which I had drafted in my humble way. In that treaty all the questions that in my judgment should be arbitrated were specified and they were specified for the purpose of enabling the United States Senate to give wholesale authority to the President in matters of arbitration so that the Senate should not be required in each single case as it may come up to exercise its prerogative of passing upon each single and separate question. The second paragraph of that arbitration treaty provided that in case of any difference with any nation the President should have the right to call for the appointment of a commission of inquiry and hostilities should not be resorted to until that commission of inquiry had reported. Of course, you can see at a glance what the purpose of the proposition was. It was to gain cooling time. If the two nations having trouble can sit down together, and umpired by a third party talk their troubles over and take three, four, five or six months to do it and then make a report on the question, why in the meantime the passions have quieted down and matters have assumed a normal aspect and the

nations will not fight. If such a provision can be enacted into international law by a common agreement or general treaties I believe it will actually mean the end of war. This proposition was advanced in 1906, a year later, by William J. Bryan, who appeared at the London Conference of the Interparliamentary Union and demanded the floor. Of course, he was not a member of the Union because he was no longer a member of Congress. Only members of Congress could be members of that organization, but by unanimous consent which I asked in his behalf he was permitted to take the platform and on that memorable occasion in Westminster Hall in London he proposed this very plan which he has recently, with the consent and approval as I understand of the President of the United States, given to the world. Some of the Senators have already said that they are getting tired of international treaties; that we made a mistake with the Hay-Pauncefote treaty; that we made a mistake in our treaty with Japan, and that it is about time for us to fight instead of making treaties; otherwise the world will regard us as a nation of shopkeepers and cowards. You can see how strong that sentiment is among these high dignitaries occupying seats in the Senate of the United States. You can see and infer from this how necessary it is on our part to prove to those people in Washington that there is a healthy, strong, enlightened and vigorous sentiment in favor of the peaceful settlement of the international disputes in accordance with the methods proposed by Mr. Bryan and Mr. Wilson. I, as a Republican, will be only too happy if the Democratic administration will succeed in carrying this plan through. (Applause.)

REV. DR. BITTING:

I should like to offer a resolution. Perhaps I had better explain a little before I read the resolution. It ought to be taken for granted that every religious and moral organization in the State of Missouri should be profoundly interested in the peace movement; it ought to be taken for granted that it ought to be profoundly interested. I shall not omit the adverb at all. There are in the State of Missouri in the

neighborhood of two hundred thousand communicants of the particular branch of the Christian Church with which I am connected. I wish there were more of the Methodist persuasion, more of the Disciple persuasion than there are. There are large numbers of organizations which take Christian names with which we co-operate which make for the progress and welfare of mankind. Now, I am persuaded that if this matter which has been called to our attention by our honored President was brought before the state meetings of these religious and moral organizations they would pass resolutions representing their constituency which could be submitted to the Senators from this state. I had occasion to go to a man prominent in public life in this city not long ago and called attention to the fact that the newspaper with which he himself was connected was guilty of large abuse toward certain Protestant movements in this state and said to him, "Do you know that every one of these Protestant organizations is watching you? Now you put yourself against us and we will turn the whole battery of them upon you." And he threw down his hands and said, "My God, I can't face that." And none of these Congressmen will be able to face this. We have the votes and they have the office; if we will do this I am satisfied that we will have the office too, as well as the votes.

"Resolved, That the executive committee of the Missouri Peace Society be directed to carry on an active campaign among religious organizations in the State of Missouri to induce them to take a firm stand in favor of international peace and in opposition to war, and to enlist such organizations in the efforts of the Peace advocates to secure the establishment of governmental machinery which will handle all international problems pacifically."

SECRETARY HUDSON :

I move the adoption of the resolution. (Motion was duly seconded and unanimously carried.)

PRESIDENT BARTHOLDT :

In the usual run of organizations the question is asked, "Is there anything for the good of the order," and the Chair

would like to hear from any one who has suggestions or remarks of any kind to make on the great question in which we are all so vitally interested.

SECRETARY TRUEBLOOD:

I wish you would say to the members of this society, the older ones and the newer ones, that the Annual Meeting of the American Peace Society is to take place at four o'clock tomorrow afternoon at the Odeon and that they are all members of the American Peace Society and entitled to attend.

PRESIDENT BARTHOLDT:

Some of us hold all kinds of honorary jobs like chairmanships and presidencies of congresses and so on, but we are simply slaves. These bosses here run us. Here is Hudson that runs me in the Missouri Society and Dr. Trueblood runs me in Washington.

MR. ATTERBURY:

I feel we are extremely fortunate in this hour. Due to our honored president we have a Missouri Peace Society and now we have the American Peace Congress. Following this, it seems to me, is the opportunity of the Missouri Peace Society to proceed with its plans of education throughout the state as has been suggested. The opportunity is ripe for us as members of the society to interest our friends and to get them to think on these matters, to spread the news of the society, to secure members for the society and to seek co-operation among the people that they may be informed. The report of the Congress is going out through the press; the people of Missouri are now willing and waiting to hear more of this movement. If we can in some way reach the people we not only enlist their interest, but we will have their continued co-operation.

PRESIDENT BARTHOLDT:

We have almost overlooked a very important item. We have to elect officers of this society for the ensuing year and the Chair will entertain propositions.

PROFESSOR USHER:

I wish to move the renomination and the election, by the secretary casting the vote of the society, of the present Board of Directors and officers. Our vice-presidents are entirely satisfactory. In our secretary, I think, we are more than fortunate. I had a good deal to do with him recently in connection with the arrangements for the Peace Congress and I certainly wish to bear testimony, and I know some others more directly in the work will bear testimony to what I say, as to his efficiency and his energy, his carelessness of himself, his never grumbling or groaning and doing an immense amount of routine work quietly and very effectively. When he comes to the committee meetings he acts as though some one else has done it, proposing things himself and letting the committee assume that they have done it. I think we could scarcely have a man to do better than he has done and I think the program of the Peace Congress and a great deal of the success of the Congress has been due definitely and directly to the secretary of the society, Professor Manley O. Hudson, of the University of Missouri. We should, as a society show our confidence and appreciation of what he has done by re-electing him unanimously and with a vote of thanks. Our treasurer, too, is a man known throughout Missouri as a peace advocate of the first importance. Mr. Brookings is not only an eminent man, but a man unquestionably solvent; and therefore is eminently the proper man for this society whose swelling funds need some one to take care of them. I therefore move that the ballot of the society be cast by the secretary.

SECRETARY HUDSON:

I should like to nominate Mrs. Ashley Cabell, Kirkwood, and Rev. S. A. Atterbury, of La Grange, as members of the Advisory Board of the Society.

[The motion and amendment was duly seconded and carried.]

PRESIDENT BARTHOLDT:

Of course, the secretary will promptly respond with a speech, but before he does I have to throw myself upon the

mercy of the court. I shall have to be in Washington most of the time. The President is calling one extra session after the other, taking us away from our homes so that it will be impossible for me to attend my duties as your president, and I should have much preferred, I speak seriously, if you had selected some one else for president of this society. But I will accept it if you approve of our previous arrangement; namely, that I simply carry out the suggestions of my boss, "Boss Hudson" here.

SECRETARY HUDSON:

I am very sorry that the meeting of the society was scheduled for so small a room. You see our other meeting hardly justified a larger one. It gratifies the officers to see the large attendance.

SECRETARY TRUEBLOOD:

I am not going to make a speech. I want to tell the members of the Missouri Peace Society that your secretary is known outside of Missouri in this work and if you expect to keep him here very long you must support him and stand by him and help him in this work so that he may have ample satisfaction in Missouri, for we at headquarters are looking for such men as he is to put in departments of our work. This is just a warning. We don't expect to steal him so long as you take proper care of him.

The Automobile Tour and Garden Party

Representative men and women of St. Louis business and social life devoted Friday to the entertainment of the delegates. The auto tour, under the direction of Chairman Albert Bond Lambert, consumed an hour, and included visits to Washington University, Forest and Tower Grove Parks, Jefferson Memorial and many other places of interest.

At the reception tendered by the Executive Committee to the officers, delegates and speakers through courtesy of the trustees and Director George T. Moore, of Shaw's Garden, a band concert was given.

Robert S. Brookings, J. L. Mauran, chairman of the garden party committee, and Director Moore, acted as escorts for Mr. Carnegie and his party during their inspection of the garden.

Governor and Mrs. Elliott W. Major, former Vice-President Charles W. Fairbanks, former Governor David R. Francis and scores of distinguished men and women from every part of the United States, as well as diplomats from foreign countries, were in attendance.

The world-famous peace advocate and others prominent in the movement stood in the receiving line under a canopy.

About 1,000 delegates and visitors participated in the garden party.

FOURTH GENERAL SESSION

IMMEDIATE ISSUES AND FUTURE AIMS

Friday Evening, May 2, at 8 o'clock

THE ODEON

HON. CHARLES W. FAIRBANKS, Presiding

PRESIDENT BARTHOLDT:

It becomes my duty, ladies and gentlemen, to introduce to you the presiding officer of the evening. A gentleman who is competent to hold down gracefully and forcefully such a belligerent body as the Senate of the United States is, we know, competent to control and run a peace meeting. (Laughter and applause.) The Hon. Charles W. Fairbanks is a statesman who is highly esteemed by every friend of the cause of peace in the United States. (Applause.) I take great pleasure in introducing, or rather presenting, Mr. Fairbanks to you.

CHAIRMAN FAIRBANKS:

Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen, it is very gratifying to me to be presented to your generous hospitality by my friend, Dr. Bartholdt. Looking over this audience and reflecting upon my past experience I hope that we shall get through the evening's exercises at least without the necessity of appealing to arbitration. It is a gratifying thing to preside over a meeting. The chair is not disturbed about any formal utterance; his duties are very well defined, and that is to listen and not to speak which is a restraint upon some chairmen I know. But I have been long enough out of politics that I do not feel the restraint myself. I want to express to you, as this will be my last opportunity, the great pleasure I have had in being permitted to participate even to some slight degree in the proceedings of this great Peace Congress. This, I feel, is an

historic event, one the full consequence of which we do not yet fully appreciate. This great Congress is making wholesome sentiment in a great cause. I feel after its deliberations are concluded the general verdict will be it has been a high-minded, intelligent, brave, patriotic assembly.

I have in my hand a telegram handed me a moment ago which is a very significant one and I trespass on the program to present it to you. It is dated San Francisco, California, May 2, 1913.

"Fourth National Peace Congress, St. Louis, Missouri.

"The Japanese Association of America sends its hearty greetings, offers its sincere co-operation to your Congress believing in the triumph of peace and justice over international misunderstanding and distrust.

"(Signed) GEORGE SHIMA, President."

You will observe, those of you who have consulted the program that there is a very interesting order of exercises before us. The first address will be upon the subject, "Christianity and World Peace," by a gentleman who is well qualified to speak to us entertainingly and instructively. It is quite fitting that a man of his eminence and his important relation to the education of the country should address us upon this occasion. The address will be made by Dean Shailer Mathews, University of Chicago Divinity School, president of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America.

Christianity and World Peace

DEAN SHAILER MATHEWS.

Real Christianity is better than Christians. For there are two Christianities: the one composed of those ideals towards which the other tends, and the other consisting of that morality which people attain who try to be good without taking too much trouble. Down through the centuries there has been conflict between these two conceptions of what the Christian religion is. On the one side have been the champions of the idealistic, absolute conceptions which are to be

traced back to Jesus. On the other side are those who have judged the teachings of Jesus and the ideals of this higher Christianity to be impracticable. Yet, as I stated, the tendency has been to approach the nobler type of Christian thought and Christian faith. Little by little the world has come to see that the ultimate settlement of issues over which men have differed does not lie in mere force; that nothing is settled finally until it is settled right. And when that great conception of righteousness as the ultimate basis of our social relations has entered men's minds and hearts, attempts have been made to institutionize the new ideals and to shape up civilization in accordance with them. It has been a long, hard struggle. It has never been popular to be better than one's age. It has never been popular to be sacrificial in temperament. The false prophet has been the popular man, the true prophet has generally made himself as well as others uncomfortable. The world can not be saved by tact. If John the Baptist had used tact he might have saved his head but he would have lost his reputation. You can not carry on great movements without struggle. There is as much opportunity for heroism in doing good to others as there is in getting hold of the goods of others. Down through the history of the struggle between the idealistic and the practical it has seemed as if truth were to forever be on the scaffold; as if God marched with the larger battalions; as if the ideal were less powerful than the material. But the grandson of the grandfather who took such a foolish view of life has come to see that the precise opposite is true. And today we abandon the ideals of our grandfathers and look to the ideals of our grandchildren.

The struggle between these two sorts of Christianity; the one heroic, sacrificial, idealistic refusing compromise, and the other compromising, ready to sacrifice the ultimate good for the immediate success is not without its victories for the more idealistic. Our hope lies today as never before in the fact that the higher is always in the long run the triumphant.

If you are to bring the question of war and peace before the jury of Christianity, you want to be sure to which of these two Christianities the members of the jury are to belong.

If you appeal to the second and cheaper Christianity you will find plenty of people to tell you peace is right but that war is right, too. A compromise Christianity is always ready to justify an appeal to force. Now, there may be, I suppose, in the course of history, to be found wars in which both sides were right, but I do not know of any such war. At any rate, the vast majority of wars could all have been averted if the principle of righteousness and of justice had been prominent in men's minds. A great nation has as its motto, "God and My right." That makes a splendidly belligerent title, but the nation that cries, "God and The Right," will be keener for arbitration than for militancy. For "God and The Right" is the watchword of Jesus and not of the warrior.

When, however, instead of appealing to the type of Christian that vindicates the military and belligerent virtues of life you appeal to the other sort of Christianity, the answer is radically different. This real Christianity says that nothing is ultimately settled until it is settled on the basis of justice, and that justice after all, is something more than a thing to be got. It is also a thing to be given. The struggle to get justice is always the struggle that leads to sacrifice. Christianity has centered itself about the dramatic figure of a founder who dared to give justice rather than to get justice. And his example strengthens that Christian principle of love which we find within ourselves. A nation ought to be as good as its best people. But true Christianity is better than the best people of a nation. A religion contented with compromise is a religion to be outgrown. If a nation refuses to follow the best ideals of its citizens, that nation is sooner or later to be crushed. Ideals are tyrannical.

The power of Christianity has never been in an insistence that people get justice. Its real power has lain in its capacity to move people to give justice. In the same proportion as the sacrificial spirit has been dominant has the real advance in our civilization been made. I do not believe that you will find that any war ever established a privilege, ever democratized a right that could not have been established or democratized without the war. In the great session of August 4, 1789, the representatives of the upper estates in the Constituent Assembly sur-

rendered to the lower estate of France privileges enjoyed for centuries, without struggle. And the French Revolution never went a step further through all its subsequent horrors and fighting than the new order thus born by the self-sacrifice of those who dared democratize privilege. It is the genius of Christianity to insist upon that sort of surrender throughout our social life. It is vastly easier to be orthodox than it is to be sacrificial; it is vastly easier to write books about any subject than it is to embrace the ideals of those books; and it is always easier to herald peace when the other surrenders than it is to herald peace when you surrender what you have regarded as your rights. But it is the very genius of Christianity to insist that the privileged must do the surrendering.

It is a sad commentary upon our moral judgments that we are accustomed to assume a superior attitude towards those men who have put this truth into operation in their own lives. Throughout history there have been those who dared say they would not prosecute others or go to war for their rights. And wherever such men have championed that idealistic type of Christianity which says, "Give justice rather than get justice," men have almost invariably turned upon them and tried to ruin, even to kill them, and then when they were dead men have built fine monuments to them. It is right to honor a martyr after he is dead, but in the midst of life to champion great principles of national sacrifice and the democratizing of privilege is too often to die without honor. We say it is more blessed to give than to receive, and believing this we are apt to be doubly generous and let the other man do the giving. (Laughter—applause.) And yet, sooner or later, national and international issues reduce themselves to this question: Shall we fight for our rights or shall we seek the right; shall we try to get justice or try to give justice? And too often as this issue is recognized men have turned from the ideals of the real Christianity to force. They have said their honor must be maintained. And so they fought to maintain honor.

Is it more honorable to kill the man that differs with you than to make him your friend? Is it more honorable to seek the thing you want than to do that which social welfare

demands? Is there any doubt as to how genuine Christianity would answer such questions?

Now, it is the business of the church, it is the business of Christianity, as a force in society to preach this unpopular doctrine and create this anti-military, justice-giving attitude of mind. We turn from it because it must cost us something individually and nationally. We prefer to have the other man do the sacrificing. None the less Christianity stands there with its searching appeal. For the great power of Christianity is not in its creedal formulas, or in its elaborate institutional life. The ultimate power of Christianity will be seen in its capacity to teach people to surrender unfair principles without fighting. That is the meaning of Jesus in those words about which we generally do not care to think: in which He taught the superiority of non-resistance to the spirit of conflict. It is as if He said to the world, "Don't fight, don't seek revenge. Better sacrifice rights than to gain the feeling of hatred and the lust of fighting." This simple teaching must ultimately triumph or the cross of Jesus Christ will always be a stumbling block.

It is a curious fact that we have worshiped Jesus because he surrendered on Calvary and have also honored that which a great soldier called hell itself. Yet the great heart of human life is ultimately to be Christian. I do not mean necessarily it will have this or that theology. The great thing which streams up through life and history from the very manger is that the only permanent force in social evolution is that which leads to peace, and not that which leads to controversy. It is the business of the church to inculcate this truth. The church, if it is to be the minister of Jesus Christ, must socialize the spirit of Calvary. And when men get keen to help one another they will not be keen to kill one another. Simply because we can kill people scientifically does not make war righteous. It is not until we are able, with the spirit of love, to go to the world ourselves and give justice to that world that the ideals of a real Christianity will be incorporated in civilization. Organized Christianity will never be much better than the folks that compose it.

When men and women are educated to believe that the great ideals of Jesus are not mere rhetorical fictions, the whole question of war will be answered. But until people are able to sacrifice that which seems to them to be a particular right war will not end. Economic considerations may help, for sometimes it seems as if God, in His Providence, was forcing nations to grow bankrupt so they can not go to war. But bankruptcy will never be the final argument for peace. I should be ashamed to expect we should base the better civilization of the future upon the economic argument. That which stirs men's hearts is not the discovery that they will find war too costly, but that they will find war too devilish. Men's nobility is not stirred by merely prudential reasons. You can give people scores of prudential reasons and they will think themselves exceptions in the order of the world. But get people on fire with the spirit of justice, so on fire that they shall not be seeking justice but seeking to give justice, and you will have a moral basis upon which institutions can be founded, upon which progress can rest, and upon which hope can realize its most glorious vision.

Is such an enthusiasm for sacrificial justice altogether out of the question? I think that any man who has studied the history of the church within the last few years feels that it is not out of the question.

Christianity is better than the church, but the church itself is coming to see as it never saw before, its great educational mission in a world that is mad with the lust to get something. It has its martyrs today, martyrs that stand forth suffering and dying, not that they may get some sort of glory after death, but that men and women may be better here, that little children may not have to work in mills, that women may have a better chance to exploit themselves rather than to be exploited, that men shall have the right to live.

All this is coming. We have seen the love of a great Liberator and we also see that as we pass from the sacrificial love of a Savior to the sacrificial duty of disciples of the Savior we are building up ideals and social minds and social passions that shall answer problems of war and peace we shall never answer in terms of dollars and cents. It is indeed

significant that the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America, representing as it does something like thirty-two denominations and possibly sixteen million Protestant church members, has a commission on world peace and is endeavoring to create a state of peace. For, ladies and gentlemen, what the world needs is not simply anti-militarism, but positive and helpful peace. (Applause.)

The mission of Christianity is not, "Thou shalt do things," but rather, "Thou shalt do those things which are embodied in the dramatic ideal set by the Founder of Christianity Himself." He dared to give His life to serve, He dared to work for others, He dared to sacrifice that others should have a peace that passes understanding. And when so-called Christian nations really become Christian nations, they will not go to arbitration courts simply to get what they can out of the decision. They will rather say, "Now, gentlemen, tell us what is right; tell us what is justice; and if your decision is against us we shall rejoice that justice is being done even though our claims are not met."

That is the ideal towards which we are moving. As we socialize this spirit of altruism that costs something, we shall legalize it, nationalize it, internationalize it. And we dare have this great hope, not as an academic, glittering generality, but as a conviction born of the observation of the past, born of a belief that the spiritual order is superior to the material order, born of the belief that God is in His world, and that God is the God of Love: a great hope that the time is coming when the real rather than the secondary Christianity shall rule men's planning; that the universal prayer is to be answered that God's Kingdom shall come and that His will of love shall be done on earth as it is in heaven. (Applause.)

CHAIRMAN FAIRBANKS:

It is a very gratifying and reassuring fact that the women of America are taking a very keen interest in this peace movement. No one is more interested in the great question which is brought here than the good women of our country.

The next address upon the program is upon the subject of "Immediate Issues and Public Sentiment," and will be given by Mrs. Lucia Ames Mead, Chairman of the Peace and Arbitration Committee of the National Council of Women. I have the great pleasure of presenting Mrs. Mead.

Immediate Issues and Public Sentiment

MRS. LUCIA AMES MEAD.

Our problem, briefly stated, is how to create public sentiment, to inspire our government boldly to take and hold the leadership in world organization and in the substitution of law for war.

The present world situation is critical and paradoxical. Two mighty, colliding forces are entering upon a final struggle, the one to win peace by peaceful means, the other claiming to aim at the same end, but to secure it by universal, endless increase of armaments. Upon the issue depends the survival of civilization. Very few admit desiring war. The issue is between two antipodal methods of securing peace. The success of the advocates for peaceful measures has roused the armament party to fever heat. Never was the strain between the two so great.

The first party asks, "How by righteous treatment of the Panama Canal Tolls issue, by consideration of Colombia's claims and Japanese' rights, by appointment of a more adequate committee to assist in making this year the program for the Third Hague Conference and by calling a halt in armaments may we regain our moral leadership of the world?"

The party to which we here belong has advanced enormously by the growth of travel, of commerce and interdependence of nations and the growing sense of brotherhood; but the armament party is with increasingly frenzied activity paralyzing this magnificent advance of civilization by carefully concocted war scares, doctored statistics and clever lobbying by agents of contractors whose advertisements too often control the animus of editorial columns. This year, the successes of the War God have been won by pen and oratory

and the scheming of navy leagues quite as much as by the bombs and brawn that have won victories in the near east. The startling revelations as to the machinations of the Krupps in Germany might in some measure be duplicated in every great power upon earth. One-half the recent outburst of chauvinism in France is due to certain scheming aeroplane manufacturers.

The peasant's winter coat must be worn to rags, the housemaid lose her job; art, science and charities must starve. Said Anatole France on reading the last order of his nation's militarists, "This means the end of culture in France."

The clever minions of our nation's militarists not only write scare head lines but they are adepts in spectacular displays. Their last feat is to capture The "Progressives" for a great naval service at Newport next July with the hero of Armageddon as spokesman, while 10,000 men of the navy assemble in the harbor on their ships to emphasize the argument for an "adequate" navy. The beloved author of "Newer Ideals of Peace," herself almost a Tolstoian as regards passive resistance, might well lead the thousands who followed her into the Third Party in a firm stand against this element of danger in its otherwise admirable program of reform.

What can we do to arouse the non-thinking public?

First, in addition to our present dignified organs of international law and of the peace societies, read by few, we need a popular illustrated journal with colored cover to be sold upon all news stands. We need to follow the wise example of almost every other reform movement but our own and learn how to advertise our doctrines, to tell our story graphically, to simplify statistics and make them comparative, to put them in picturesque and telling forms. Let us compel men to listen even if we have to condescend to using a megaphone.

Secondly, we should have exhibits on national dangers and national defenses as entertaining, as illuminating as the civic exhibit in New York in which a bell buzzes every five minutes when the land values increase 1000 dollars. We need to put our wits upon the problem of the utilization of cartoons, of moving picture shows, of electric signs flashing a message every night down Pennsylvania avenue which every Congress-

man must read and ponder. We need in Washington a spacious hall, open day and night to passersby, where shall be displayed in concrete, brilliant form the significance of the facts that no dull pages of statistics and pious essays will ever convey. We have been singularly unimaginative and slow in teaching by modern, graphic methods. Suppose a frieze of 600,000 little black coffins be painted around such a hall representing the needless deaths last year within our country; four out of every ten who die perishing from society's neglect and ignorance. Beneath these 600,000, paint 15,000 little red coffins representing all the Americans that ever perished by foreign bullets. Imagine a lurid representation of the \$450,000,000 of good property burned up last year, together with the comparison of fire loss in England, Germany and other nations, which in this matter are so much more civilized than we. Let there be a model of a dreadnought and then a long line of photographs representing the hundreds of permanent college buildings that combined equal in cost only one short-lived dreadnought. Imagine hundreds of similar contrasting representations duplicated in halls in a dozen cities. All this would cost money, but not so much as the cost of many a private yacht. The education of congressmen and taxpayers who viewed this exhibit might result in saving thousands of lives and millions of dollars in waste, by a better apportionment of appropriations, due to the revelation of the ghastly discrepancy between our certain dangers at home and our purely theoretical dangers from abroad.

Thirdly, we need money. It is commonly assumed that the peace cause is amply financed. The painful fact is that all the annual income in the world devoted to the peace cause is less than the cost of one little torpedo boat destroyer, and a large share of this is unavailable for sorely-needed, immediate propaganda. Moreover, the wealthy Navy League, with young J. P. Morgan treasurer, his brother-in-law and other multi-millionaires as members, has enormous power and is using it, as witness the strenuous efforts made by the league this season to allure college students into spending vacations in target practice on battleships, their fierce endeavor to secure a council of defense on which militarists shall dominate and

the wide circulation of sixty-seven arguments for a great navy, which brought thousands of letters to congressmen last winter urging two battleships.

There is need for enormously larger funds to provide antidotes for the poisonous sophistries spread abroad by the Army and Navy Leagues of the world to which an Army League in America has just been added.

Fourthly, if we are to offset the constant, persistent influence of "the 727 active and retired army and navy officers who," said Justice Brewer, "live in Washington and are making our national capital a military center," we must enroll a larger number of citizens than are in our American peace society, its state branches and affiliated societies. Why not enroll without dues or with nominal dues all citizens who hold our views in a great auxiliary which can be circularized from headquarters and use its moral and political influence whenever a crisis threatens? These silent, now ineffective, units scattered thickly all over the country, must be coalesced, strengthened and made a commanding power at the polls. They must be encouraged to question candidates and, if they can not see straight and are terrified by bogies, to refuse to give them control over appropriations. They must be enlisted to do local work in getting peace literature into town libraries, in refuting sophistry in the press, in guarding the moving-picture shows from alluring aspects of war and in studying the modern economics of internationalism. Let us not wait a month in beginning an auxiliary enrollment. If more funds are needed for it, they must somehow be found. Too often we have shown scant interest in the toilers, the common folk, who are our strongest asset. A college diploma by no means signifies that the mental power which has mastered languages, mathematics and science has freed its possessor from prejudice, tradition, or poor reasoning. Many an artisan might teach the distinguished Harvard professor who recently referred to war as "the great vehicle of human progress" what flouting of all history this thoughtless sentence proves. He might even with his mere grammar school training show the supreme significance of discovery, invention, philosophy, religion and art from the dirty troglo-

dyte to Plato and St. Paul, Gutenberg, Pasteur and the Fourth National American Peace Congress, and how negligible a part the mutual destruction of human beings has been as a motive force in evolution and progress.

The socialists who met in Basel last November representing an enormous constituency in many lands declared that the time would soon arrive when if their governments should go to war and order them to slay each other, the wheels of industry would cease to move and the paralyzed nations would wait the behest of the men who make and carry their soldiers' food and instruments of war.

These men, spite of their limitations, were pioneers, teachers of truth, with far deeper insight into God's universe than the Harvard Ph. D. who recently wrote to me thus: "Battle is the normal thing for all created things. Without it, men, beasts and nations weaken and die miserably. Wars in general have much to recommend them. May the time be far away when they stop entirely." Those less educated men at Basel could have told the Ph. D. the distinction which he failed to see between the results of that constant, wholesome contest between man and the evils in his environment—cold, famine, ignorance, vice—and that deliberate, concerted slaughter of groups of one species by groups of another of the same species which in the whole animal creation exists only among human beings. Confused thinking, and lack of logic in this matter of war and peace seem quite as often to be found among those who have high technical knowledge as among humbler folk who not so often fail to see the wood for the trees.

Among those with great power of creating sound public sentiment, though they may have slight technical knowledge of what is commonly called "national defense," are the 3,000,000 organized women in the Federation of Clubs, the Christian Temperance Union and patriotic and missionary societies. These women can influence one-half of the voters of the country and they are nearly all pledged to the peace cause. In nine states they influence the election of eighteen senators, who are the ratifiers of treaties, and thirty-five representatives who vote appropriations. These women in this privileged

land have had even more secondary education than men; they know as much of foreign travel, more of foreign literatures and may be trusted more than men to care for international ethics. It is woman's privilege and duty to study the most vital problem in the world today and to enlighten the busy breadwinners, often too absorbed in stock reports or sporting news to perceive the relative values of life.

Women set social standards. It is for them to settle the tone of conversation in the home, to ensure magnanimous, sympathetic talk, to develop from the nursery up to the college the power of putting oneself in the other fellow's place. Women teachers are largely responsible for the next generation's foreign policy. They can allay or foster prejudices; they can put the emphasis on either rights or duties and teach boys to tell their fathers what it means when our government, which for a hundred years has kept the peace with every naval power, is today spending two dollars out of every three in payment for past and future war. Women must not shirk the responsibility laid on them at once to study, to think clearly, to speak out courageously and command the attention of all patriotic citizens to our nation's unique opportunity to turn the world back from the panic and nightmare which now obsess the civilized world.

What an inspiration, not only to us but to the world, would be a presidential message urging no new battleship this next year, but an expenditure instead of \$10,000,000—two-thirds of its cost—in lessening the awful, needless death rate that disgraces us among the nations and of \$5,000,000, the remaining third upon a Peace Budget. Imagine this put into the hands of a special commission to be used in cementing our friendships with all nations by help in time of trouble, by exchange of visits of Congressmen and editors, by spreading authentic reports, refuting the suspicious and slanders of the yellow press and in every way promoting understanding. The public sentiment, whose creation is my theme, can alone make such a proposition certain.

Our President, indeed, might beg Congress for such a wise appropriation and be refused. But he can demand it and secure it if the American people once comprehend the critical

situation and command their public servants to cease their cowardly fears and courageously adopt the only course that can exalt us to world leadership and save the world from the abyss.

CHAIRMAN FAIRBANKS:

The next speaker has spoken much from one end of the country to the other. He is a rational thinker and an orator of commanding power. His voice is always heard in behalf of those things making for sobriety and for progress along wholesome lines. His subject is a timely and attractive one, "The Outlook for Peace—the United States and Japan." I take very great pleasure in presenting to you my friend, the Rev. John Wesley Hill, President International Peace Forum.

The Outlook—The United States and Japan

REV. JOHN WESLEY HILL.

In a world crowded with military activities, its history crimson with the carnage of war, its races and nations drilled and equipped in the art of war, its institutions permeated with the spirit of war, and its resources drained in the cause of war, we may well ask, "What is the Outlook for Peace, the hope of universal concord?" Let us frankly admit that the outlook is not cloudless. There are some discouragements. Nothing is gained in substituting sentiment for statistics. It is easy to drift and dream, to reap bounteous harvests from the golden fields of imagination, and to soar over mountains of difficulty, upon the unfettered wings of fancy. It is more difficult to climb the mountains, harder to tunnel them, and still harder to level them. Better to recognize the dark side of the problem, than to cry, "Peace, Peace," without a knowledge of the difficulties involved. We must meet the contrary facts, however stubborn, and thus be prepared to grapple with them. The spirit of war is world wide; the nations are armed to the teeth; the seas of the world are ploughed with dreadnoughts; there is still envy and rivalry among the nations; the "sick man of Europe" is suffering a relapse; Mexico is a boiling cauldron; the Republic of China has barely escaped

infantile paralysis; Japan is in a ferment of apprehension over the dreaded obnoxious legislation of California; the world's horizon is skirted with war clouds. But admitting all this, giving due weight to the discouragements by which we are confronted, accurately measuring the arguments and agencies arrayed against us, following the war talk of the day, which flows like a slimy, defiling stream around the world, noting all that the jingo papers say, and the Devil scarcely believes worse, and then multiplying all this news by the area of the planet and its population—we are still obliged to believe that the world is nearer the millennium of peace than ever before, and the dreams and hopes and prophecies which yesterday were so dimly seen are today certain of consummation.

One ray of the dawn I see in the gradual disappearance of the arguments which have so long been urged against the cause of peace. "Nations must fight, in order to preserve the manly virtues of fortitude and self denial," it is said. Well, that argument has been relegated to the scrap heap of exploded fallacies. It is refuted by science and history. If biology has established any law, it is this, that the breed of today constitutes the brawn and brain of tomorrow. Heredity is the truest thing in nature. Influences working for the undermining of physical strength, the weakening of the intellect, the arrest of energy and enterprise, must in the very nature of things result in a corresponding deterioration in succeeding generations. History works with biology. Rome fell because the old Roman stock was for the most part exterminated through war. The Napoleonic wars are said to have reduced the average stature of Frenchmen some three inches. The flower of the youth of France consumed in the fierce flame of war, only the older and less vigorous remained to perpetuate the race. Nations grow in virility during periods of peace. Look at the astonishing progress of the German nation, following the Franco-Prussian war. The lesson of our own history is the same. Since the Civil War, we have had a half century of peace, save for slight interruptions through skirmishes with Indians, and a flurry with Spain. This half century of peace has been the most prolific period of development in our history. The story of our industrial expansion

reads like a page from the "Arabian Nights." Our increasing wealth is the marvel of statisticians. Our population has advanced to a hundred million, and our flag has been lifted so high that the light of its stars is reflected around the world. Is it thinkable that if our people were now suddenly called to arms, they would display less courage than their ancestors? Has peace enervated them, making them unfit for the hardships and perils of camp and field? The fact is, the spirit of peace is the secret of our virility. It has had the same proportionate effect upon all the nations of the earth. Peace is the nursery of physical and moral strength; war is the school of the servile arts, the playground of the baser qualities of the human heart. On the dawning sense of these realities, we may base a rational hope for the upbuilding of that international sentiment which constitutes the most efficient antidote for war.

Another sign of promise appears in the attitude the working classes are at last taking toward the question of war. They know that war means destruction, not only of life and property, but of productive power. They know that the army is drawn from their ranks, and that their homes are drained to fill the cemeteries of the battlefields. They know that the cost of a single shot from one of the great guns of our battleships is \$1,700—a sum sufficient to furnish a good home for a working man, or a skilled working man's wages for a year. They know that even in times of peace, this war system consumes seven-eighths of the world's taxes—in all, two billion, two hundred and fifty millions of dollars annually—a sum sufficient in a single generation to supply the world with all the appointments of a maximum civilization. They know that while the stock gamblers may water their stock, there is no power that can water a debt—not even a military debt—that it remains a constant burden, whose interest is an annual drain, and whose principal stands in the way of industrial development. And it is little wonder that the laborers are crying for relief, seeking to throw off the heart-crushing burden of militarism, and so escape its cruel exactions.

It is likewise a propitious indication that capital is at last arrayed against the carnage of war. The business man understands that war does not pay. A little while ago, Mr. Carnegie

said: "If any controversy arises between Great Britain and the United States, it can be entrusted to the merchants of London and New York for peaceful settlement, with honor to both nations." "Business is business," and it is a sign of promise that business has brought action for a divorce against the business of war. Ours is distinctly a commercial nation. Our merchants sweep the entire horizon of the world. Our commerce is going everywhere. The inventor and the mechanical engineer are devising new methods of toil, new machines for accomplishing more and better work. Over a million patents for new and useful inventions have been issued from the Patent Office at Washington. We have more miles of railroad than any other nation in the world, and almost as many as all other nations combined. Now, all these interests look askance at the havoc of war. They shrink from the destruction of life and property. They are loath to see the efforts of the intellectual turned aside from the advancement of civilization into the barbarism of killing. And so capital thunders its protest against the carnage of the sword; the business cries, "Halt! Enough waste of wealth! Enough destruction of life and productive power! Enough military drain upon the wealth resource of nations! Enough burden imposed upon the shoulders of labor and capital!"

Then again, we are encouraged by the deepening consciousness of internationalism which is pervading the world. Nationalism was the keynote of the last century; Internationalism is the magic word of this. Instantaneous world communication is just at hand. The antipodes of the earth are but the opposite sides of a little, narrow lane. "Presently men will traverse the earth as the gods of Homer did the sky, in three paces." The telephone and telegraph have not only feet, but ears. We are living everywhere at once. The impulse toward internationalism is quickened by travel and diplomacy. The nations have been brought together by material forces only to start into action greater immaterial forces. Electricity is finishing what steam began. Just as individuals and nations advance in the achievements of civilization, displaying in their conduct higher regard for peace and justice, so these ideals

of private and national conduct are manifestly inspiring all nations in their relations with each other. Thus, as the world draws closer together in the recognition of a common humanity, there is carried into the international field the insistent demand for greater peace and unity in enforcing everywhere the principles of a high morality—principles without which both national and international life would soon fall into anarchy and ruin.

Another ray of the dawn is to be seen in the sincere love of peace which is animating the rulers of the world. There is not a ruler in Europe whose ambition is warlike, who does not pride himself upon having bestowed upon his subjects the blessings of peace. True, they do it according to the psychology of monarchs, who prefer that the good done should be a bestowment of their individual beneficence, rather than the outcome of beneficent institutions. True, they prepare for war just the same, and occasionally they fight, but this only indicates the precarious character of the situation. The saving element is this: Hidden schemes of aggression are disappearing; ulterior motives in the fierce fulminations of war becoming less rapacious and pronounced. Yesterday, under the principle that "Might makes right," the territory of defenseless nations was at the mercy of the powerful; but today, spheres of influence, boundary lines of national occupancy and control, are settled by international justice. The time has passed when a strong nation can despoil a weak one, when a robber nation can plunder a defenseless nation, without being arrested in the name of humanity and justice. The rulers of Europe are striving for peace as never before. True the Balkan war cloud fills the European sky, but presently, when it is dispelled, the sun of peace will shine with increasing splendor, driving back the grief and gloom that invariably follow in the wake of battle, and kiss into renewed beauty and fertility the fields which are now running red with the blood of war. Such is also the attitude of the rulers of the far East. We are hearing much about the sensitiveness and bellicose spirit of Japan. Indeed, whenever an increased military or naval appropriation is desired by the

representatives in Congress of steel and powder, armor plate and dreadnoughts, the effort is made to stir the nation into a frenzy over what is characterized as the "Yellow Peril." That peril, however, is purely the figment of a distorted imagination. In California it is the creation of race prejudice. During my recent visit to Japan, I found no evidence of envy, jealousy or hostility among the people of that Island Empire. Upon the other hand, I witnessed the unmistakable signs of a growing love of peace among the people there. During my audience with the Mikado, he repeatedly expressed his interest in the cause of the world's peace, declared that the classic name of Japan, "Yamato," literally means "Peace," and spoke of our former President as the "Lantern Bearer of Universal Peace."

Then again, we are heartened and inspired by the fact that this is the era of arbitration. During the past ten years there have been ninety-six arbitration treaties signed. Previous centuries have had ten wars to one arbitration. The first ten years of this century witnessed the signing of fifty treaties to one war. Why, we are about to celebrate a hundred years of peace among English-speaking peoples. The Treaty of Ghent was a universal peace treaty in embryo. Into it were woven the golden strands of Anglo-Saxon unity. Who can deny that it is the moral influence of this Anglo-Saxon alliance that is largely responsible for the change of attitude among the great nations of the earth? The English-speaking peoples, as a whole, so long as they keep the peace between themselves, have in reserve an all-potent physical restraining force. The "Union Jack" and the "Stars and Stripes," united, would constitute a tremendous power for peace. And when the flags of France and Germany are added, the compact will be irresistible—a power without the consent of which not a soldier upon the face of the earth could lift his foot, nor a bullet be fired beyond the muzzle of a gun, and this without resort to the sword.

As great as the achievements of arbitration have been, we have not quite reached the goal. True, we have agreed to submit to arbitration questions which diplomacy has hereto-

fore considered arbitrable; but we must go a step further. We must continue the agitation until not only the United States and Great Britain, but the world powers are united in a compact to submit to an International Arbitral Court every difference arising between them—even questions of honor and vital interest. If the controversy over the Panama toll is such a question, it should be submitted to arbitration, regardless of the consideration as to whether we should be winners or losers before the International Court. There may be greater questions arising, involving points of the most vital interest; but the principle is the same. The nations of the earth must abandon the farcical idea that they are bound to fight over a point of honor. Dueling in defense of national honor is as criminal as in defense of individual honor, and until this relic of barbarism is relegated to oblivion, it is idle for us to boast of our Christian civilization. It is the glory of Mr. Taft that he actually negotiated such a treaty with England and France. That epochal achievement lifts his administration to the highest level attained by any President in our entire history, and must of necessity perpetuate the name of William Howard Taft through countless centuries. We deplore the fact that the Senate of the United States failed to ratify the treaty, that the gentlemen composing that august body, higgling and haggling over questions of Senatorial prerogative and dignity, failed to grasp the greatness of the opportunity afforded them to carve out a new era in the progress of mankind, to, in fact, ennoble and exalt our nation among all nations of the earth.

But, my friends, while the cause has been halted, it has not been defeated. We rejoice that the impetus given this movement by the incisive and inspiring leadership of our former President is being accelerated under the leadership of the patriotic, scholarly and peace-loving President Wilson, and that notwithstanding the recent discouragement through which our sacred cause has passed, the dream of peace shall soon be brought to pass, for

“ Behind the dark unknown
Standeth God, amidst the shadows,
Keeping guard above His own.”

But the question is frequently asked, "What do you hope to accomplish? Do you really expect to abolish war altogether?" The peace problem, the war against war, partakes of the nature of every other problem; and precisely as we are not deterred from building schools and hospitals and churches, from endowing medical faculties and institutions for moral and spiritual instruction, on account of the mass of ignorance, disease and crime that will exist even after we have done all we can against these evils, so we must not waver in our efforts to secure permanent peace through institutions devised for that purpose. We must consider the abolition of war, total and uncompromising, as our ultimate aim, just as in our struggle against ignorance, disease and crime, we make no allowance for any part. And so we move steadily, though slowly, forward, aiming at perfection in order to get approximation, and while much of the darkness of ignorance, superstition and barbarism beclouds our vision, we rejoice that the darkness of the night is whitening into the luster of the morning, and the morning is marching into the meridian splendor of the noon-lit sky.

"Young men and maidens, old men and matrons," yes, and little children, all are enlisted under our banner. Every pulpit is a parapet from which the gatling guns of Gospel Truth and the heavy artillery of statistical, philosophic and psychologic research are trained, and every true minister of the Most High is a messenger of peace, appearing upon the mountain peaks of human progress, proclaiming, "The day cometh." Yes, and the great specialists are with us; statesmen like Taft, diplomats like Bryce, educators like Jordan, business men like Ginn, and humanitarians like Andrew Carnegie, who, in league with the unseen forces of civilization, are working for the overthrow of the bigotry and brutality which are ever waging war upon peace and prosperity; and though the battle seems long and the agencies at our command inadequate to measure against the colossal enginery of war, yet without counting the cost, but laying upon the altar of humanity our time, our talent, our treasure and our all—willing to spend and be spent in the bold propaganda of the sublime ideas and ideals which we represent, we press forward, in the gladsome assurance

that the day is coming when the only battlefield will be the market open to commerce and the mind open to new ideas. And so we throw to the wind our fears and dismiss all idle questions springing from ignorance, expediency and fear—such questions as “What does it all mean?” and “Do you expect to succeed?”—and paraphrasing the language of Daniel Webster in his memorable debate with Mr. Hayne, of South Carolina, we exclaim, “When our eyes shall be turned to behold for the last time the sun in heaven, may we not see him shining on a world at war. Let the last, lingering and feeble glance, however, rather behold the glorious banner of peace, full high advanced, bearing for its motto no such miserable interrogatory as “What is all this effort worth?” but everywhere, spread all over in characters of living light, blazing on all its ample folds, as it floats over the sea and over the land, and in every wind under the whole heavens—that other sentiment dear to every patriotic heart, “Universal Peace and Brotherhood, now and forever, one and inseparable!”

CHAIRMAN FAIRBANKS:

There is one more address upon the program. The subject is, “The Better Way.” We will now be addressed by a man holding an important and distinguished position in the Government, one who speaks instructively as well as in an interesting way, the Hon. Philander P. Claxton, United States Commissioner of Education.

The Better Way

HON. PHILANDER P. CLAXTON.

I come first to bring you the greeting and the assurance of the success of your cause from the great standing army of six hundred thousand teachers in the public and private schools, colleges and universities of these United States, who are with this cause as no other six hundred thousand people to be found anywhere in the world.

The German statesman was right when he said, “Whatever you would have in the State of tomorrow, put into the schools of today.” In the normal schools, colleges and univer-

sities is going to be determined the universal peace, or at least peace between the nations. Not only is that true in the United States but more is it becoming true in other countries.

Last year when the Bureau of Education issued a bulletin with a suggested program for use on the 18th day of May in the schools of the United States it was heartily applauded by the school authorities in nearly all of the countries of Europe. Plans were made that a similar one should be issued at least in some of the states this year.

The subject of my address is stated, "The Better Way." The better way first of serving God. For some reason, man has always thought it his duty to pay service of some kind to his God, but the time was when the people living in any little bit of territory, those belonging to any little group or tribe of people, each had its own god, while the people belonging to another clan inhabiting for the time another little bit of territory with a different name, had their god. In their imagination and in their teachings the gods of the two peoples were enemies, one to the other. They thought the people who worshiped a god could serve him best by destroying those who worshiped another god, the people of another clan living in another bit of territory. That was a long time passing away. The world has begun to recognize the fatherhood of one God; that there was only one and not many.

They conceived of him in different ways and so-called "Holy Wars" were continually waged. The priests blessed the banners of the armies that went forth to dye their hands in the blood of their fellowmen, to destroy their cities, to lay waste their fields, and to leave their women widows and their children fatherless.

That continued until within the memory of many of us. But with the coming of the twentieth century, yea with the passing of the nineteenth, the people began to see another way of serving their God. They began to understand that in no kind of way can an individual render service to God except by serving his fellowman; that he can not render service that will be acceptable to the Prince of Peace and to the Father of all the human race except as he will serve his fellowman without regard to race, or without regard to kinship. The

deadly wars are things of the past. We all realize that war is hell and preparation for it the vestibule thereto.

Again, it has always been thought well to serve one's country. Patriotism is a beautiful word. To die for one's country has always been thought to be desirable; and so it is; so it was; so it is until now, and so it shall ever be if it be necessary to die. But the day is past when it was thought easy, honorable and well to kill other men for the good of your country.

Man's country has been considered the place in which he was born; where he lived; where his friends were; where his kindred were; where his investments were; where he traveled and from which he received the books and the works of art, and the philosophies that guided him, and made his life worth living, lifting it up above the plane of the brute. With ancient peoples that was for any man, a very small bit of territory.

The Jews, with their little bit of territory of ten or fifteen square miles, with an ocean on one side and the mountainous heights on the other, thought of that little place as their home and there was no other place that they could think of as being their home.

The Romans had one word both for enemy and for stranger. They could not distinguish between the two. And so it was for the people down through the Middle Ages, living in their little lands, narrowly hemmed in without international trade, without traveling from one place to another, but going only when the tribe migrated. People had to have a wider country than that. Many of those in this audience probably were born in distant countries. Your kindred live in all the climes of the earth; you draw your means of support from all the goods of the earth. There is not a country on the face of the globe that does not contribute to your daily food. It is on your breakfast table, on your dinner table, and in the clothing that you wear. The investments of St. Louisans are in Mexico and in Germany and France; in London and over in Australia, and in China and Japan, and everywhere else; and the dividends come back from there.

Many of us travel abroad. A school teacher will belt the earth in his vacation and come back home and tell the story

of how our songs were written in Germany, how our pictures were painted in Italy. We receive our philosophy from the great universities of other countries. The monuments that we erect to our heroes are cast in Germany or in France or elsewhere.

So man today has the whole world for his country. We are, for convenience of government, divided into small areas, each with a separate government. So easily is the trip performed that over night in a Pullman car we sleep through different countries, scarcely knowing or caring where we are the next morning. There can never again be a war between peoples of this world except in the nature of fratricidal strife, people of the same community warring against each other.

We are beginning to learn that the only way we can serve the little bit of country that we call our own—Missouri, or the United States, or Germany, or France—is not by bringing any kind of injury or destruction or retribution or subjugation to another country, but by helping the other country in its progress, in its development and in its wealth.

It was said of Randolph of Roanoke that beyond Virginia's boundary line his patriotism perished. That might be well enough then, but it can not be for the patriotic man who lives in St. Louis or Missouri or the United States or in any city or country of the world today. There can not come to any place in the world today any kind of catastrophe that injures the people that will not sooner or later be felt by you here in St. Louis. If the tea crops should be damaged by a drought or the blight in China, many a woman in St. Louis and Missouri and throughout the country must pay a higher price, and many must do without their tea. If there should be damage to the silk crop there it would be the same. If the boll weevil destroys the cotton crop of Texas the loom will suffer and people over the world will pay a higher price for their clothing.

If our six millions of men are drawn from active occupations then the other people of the world must bear the burden of the support of those six millions and every other person must be the poorer as the result thereof. There is only one way in which a man today can be patriotic, and that is with the heartiest good will for every other nation in the world,

doing what he can to build it to the highest stage of civilization, to the highest idealism with the largest amount of material wealth and the greatest amount of power and strength. It has come to be that there is a commonwealth of the world just as there is a commonwealth of the states.

There is a better way to use wealth than in the way we are using it. It has been said a half dozen times on this platform since this Congress began that our armed peace is more destructive than war. You were told a moment ago that two and a half billion dollars is required by armies and navies in this time of peace, and it is. But there is another cost to be added, if you will. Six millions of men in Europe, the United States, China and Japan—not counting those of South and Central America—six millions of men are under arms tonight on the battleships and in the barracks and on the lines where the soldiers are. And those six millions of men are all in the prime of life, when their services are of most value. A man in the prime of life is worth five hundred dollars a year, and that is a waste of three billions of dollars again. That does not count the pensions for past wars, nor does it count many hundreds of the men who are working at useless jobs building battleships and other things that will produce no result after they are built.

Last year the crops grown in United States, if you count them once and not twice, were only seven billions of dollars. If all the people of these United States in all the fields and gardens, in the cotton fields of the South and the grain fields of the West, in the fruit orchards from Oregon to Florida, after they had labored all the year long and had harvested their crop and brought it in with thanksgiving to enjoy it, if suddenly some great flame had come from the heavens and swept it away, that would represent what the world paid for war last year in time of profound peace.

We are learning that there is a better way. The countries of Germany, France, England and the United States, these four great civilized countries paid for ordnance—not only lost the labor of men under arms, but directly out of their treasuries to the support of navies and armies, they have paid one and

a quarter billions of dollars a year. In forty years six hundred and fifty billions of dollars.

Fifty billions of dollars will buy twenty million country homes at a cost of twenty-five hundred dollars—a fairly good country home. Twenty million homes with six people, father, mother and four children in each! That would mean about 120,000,000 of people rendered homeless in one generation by the cost of standing armies and battleships manned on the seas. No war will ever cost that much. If you want to know what that means, that number is ten millions more than all the people living in the open country and small villages in the four countries, which have actually used up the cost of good homes for all these in one generation. There are better means of using the money than that. One way is to demand its use for schools.

When I went in the office of the Secretary of the Interior the other day to ask him about some matter, he said, "I see you are going to the South and out to St. Louis. What are you going to do?" I told him what I was going to do, going to Louisville and St. Louis, and said, "I am going to the Fourth American Peace Congress." He said, "Interested in peace, are you?" I said, "I am, because if we could reduce the cost of the army and navy of the United States to a reasonable amount I could double the salary of every teacher in every school and college in the whole of the United States, and there would be money left." (Applause.)

Listen! With the money that we paid out of the treasury of the United States last year to the army and navy and for battleships and fortifications, not including things like the Panama Canal and other good things that the army does, we could have done these things: First, we could have built a great national university, at a cost of ten million dollars a year, which is just three times the amount of the richest of all the rich universities. Then we could have put in a new state university in each State at a cost of a million dollars a year. Then we could have put in each of the states five great normal schools to train teachers how to teach children and given a hundred thousand dollars to each of these normal schools. Then we could put in each of the states five new technological

schools, each with an income of a hundred thousand dollars a year to teach young men to take raw material and transfer it into goods of wealth. In addition, we could have put into each of the states thirty agricultural schools to teach country boys and girls how to cultivate the soil and make it produce more and how to use the production to better advantage in the home. Fifteen thousand dollars to each of these thirty agricultural schools in each state of the United States! In addition, we could have built five thousand new high schools, an average of one hundred to each of our states and could have given to each one of them twenty thousand dollars a year. That is more than the great majority of them get twice over. In addition, we could have given to each of the states one million of dollars for the use of their elementary schools. In addition, we could have bought all the books used by the children in all the schools of the United States and paid for them, and could have given to each of the states a quarter of a million dollars for public libraries for the reading of the gospel of peace. I feel that is a better way to use the money than the way it is used. (Prolonged applause.)

In some other ways it would have given to each of the states of the nation a little more than five millions of dollars to fight the white plague. In the State of Missouri and the other states of the nation, that sum for ten years would make the disease unknown forever in the United States unless it were imported from abroad. Or if we wish to drain the swamps of the South, we could reclaim thirty-five million acres there, more than the armies would accomplish if they added Mexico to the United States.

If you want to go back to the expenditures of the world, we could have for what the people put into war last year dug five Panama Canals and paid every dollar of the cost and not have owed a cent of bonds. We are learning that there is a better way to use the results of the labor of man. And I think we are also beginning to understand that there is a better thing to do in time of peace than to prepare for war.

I like to dream of the past occasionally to see what might have been done under certain conditions, and to think what

might have happened if we would have used the five hundred millions of dollars that the war with Spain and in the Philippine Islands cost us. We bought the Philippines for twenty millions and probably for two hundred millions we could have bought Cuba. Spain could have saved her honor by taking two hundred millions and educated the people of Spain in peace and developed their resources there and we would have had two hundred millions more for our own use here. We have come to understand that honor does not require that you shall put to death the man who happens to be for the time being in disagreement with you; nor is it necessary to destroy or humiliate the nation therefor.

There stands in the next block here a high school building, the pride of this city. When a child has been born, he is trained in the home by his mother, sent to kindergarten, educated in the elementary school and the grammar schools at a cost of sixty to seventy-five dollars annually; he is then given a high school education. There is a better use to make of that man than to shoot him on the battlefield and dump him into the trench like a dog. There is a better use to be made of him.

The money spent after all does not prepare for war. I heard it said by a man who was speaking with authority within less than one month that our navy is not ready for war. We have spent a billion dollars on it and we are now wholly unprepared to go to war. Of course, a friendly nation that is self-respecting will not ask us to go to war until we are ready, and there lies the beauty of the whole situation. (Applause.)

I have traveled on your highways here in Missouri. They are built at a cost of the whole state; they are the highways of the people of Missouri. I dare not and you dare not put any fortifications on them anywhere. You dare not stand there with your pistol, shooting about you because the whole State of Missouri has the same right that you have there. I believe there is a better way on this great highway of the nations, the sea, than for each individual nation to put its fortifications along its shores and to put its battleships there to injure the commerce of other nations. Some time we will recognize that

the sea is the highway of the nations and no nation will be permitted to put any ship on it that may injure the commerce crossing from shore to shore, or to injure the commercial ports and the men who builded those ports. Then in order to see that it is done, the united nations all agreeing will put a police force there strong enough to see that no pirate nation can or shall make the highway dangerous.

Again, I can not help believing, and I hope you will not misunderstand what I say now, I can not help believing that in some kind of way the world belongs to its children. I do know that it is for the good of every race and every people in the world, that every race and every people and every individual shall have the opportunity to work to the very best advantage, producing the largest amount of material for food, clothing to wear, shelter and the other things that help make life worth living in the highest type of civilization. Some sections of the world are largely overcrowded. It is almost impossible for the people there to make a living. There are vast stretches of country almost totally uninhabited, where the soil is fertile, where the climate is congenial, where there are mines and wealth under the ground and where there are great forests. Now, I don't think any nation should be called upon to give up its territory that its own people can use for the advantage of another. That would be wrong, but the nations joining together should help to colonize these places, assigning this place to one and that to another. Let the many come together under one order. The United States are an example of the fact that many races may live together in peace and prosperity and for the advantage, one of the other.

When we shall fully understand the better way, which I have only suggested in part, then will the world begin really to lift itself into civilization on a higher plane, into a better atmosphere, into the broader sunshine, giving mother earth opportunities to rejoice, as the mother of the race, when she sees her children laden not with the bloody spoils of the slain, but laden with the spoils of peace and commercial gain the world round. Then shall the people from the ends of the earth

recognize the fatherhood of God, recognize the brotherhood of man, and the prophecy shall come and be fulfilled:

“Peace on earth to men of good will.”

You and I and the others who are working towards this cause are working at the foundation of the temple of the future. Our work is sacred and the ages to come will bless us if we work wisely. I thank you for your attention. (Continued applause.)

MASS MEETING

YOUNG PEOPLE'S CHRISTIAN FEDERATION OF ST. LOUIS

Friday Evening, May 2, at 8 o'clock

THIRD BAPTIST CHURCH

ANDREW CARNEGIE, Presiding

INVOCATION

REV. DR. S. J. NICCOLLS.

Almighty God, our Heavenly Father, we Thy children lift up our hearts to Thee in praise and thanksgiving. Thou hast led us in the past, and we ask Thee this evening that Thy spirit may be with us, directing us in all the services of this hour. Help us to understand that which Thou hast set forth in Thy Holy Word, and may we understand that according to Thy purposes the day is coming when men shall beat their swords into ploughshares and their spears into pruning hooks, and when each shall be seated in peace and quietness under his own vine and fig tree, and none shall molest or make them afraid. Thou hast sent unto us Thy Son, the Prince of Peace, and we know that it is only under His leadership and through our submission to Him that peace is to be established in this sin-troubled and suffering world. O, Thou Prince of Peace, Who hast breathed Thy blessing upon us, saying: "Peace I leave with you. My peace I give unto you," let Thy spirit take possession of us this evening, that we may see as Thou seest. Sometimes we see dimly and faintly, sometimes with half-opened eyes, but help us through Thee to see the light. Grant Thy blessings upon the services of this hour. Thou hast pronounced Thy benediction upon the peacemakers. May we all lead such God-like lives in our conduct and relationship that we shall be known as the children of God. Be with those

who shall address us this evening, guiding them by Thy spirit, that they interpret Thy thoughts unto us. And bless, we beseech Thee, the Congress that has assembled in this city looking to the furtherance of the establishment of peace throughout the world. May its deliberations be wise and right. And do Thou grant that they may be for the furtherance of the cause of bringing in the reign of everlasting peace, and the establishment of human brotherhood among all men. We ask this in our Redeemer's name. Amen.

REV. DR. W. J. WILLIAMSON :

I am quite sure you want to begin the program of tonight, and yet I can not let this moment pass without calling your attention to one or two very significant facts.

In the first place, I want to say this meeting tonight, in which more than two thousand people are crowded into this great auditorium, bears testimony to the fact that Christian people are interested in world peace. (Applause.) The church of the Lord Jesus Christ must stand for that, and does.

In the second place, I want to call attention to the fact that there are two men who have worked very hard to make this Peace Congress a success, and they have made it a success. I trapped them into this; they didn't dream what I wanted to say. I want you to know a successful young business man, who is president of the Young People's Christian Federation of St. Louis, who is entitled to great credit for bringing about this splendid meeting. Stand up, Mr. Wolff. (Applause.) I want you to know another splendid young man, a professor in the University of Missouri, who has been coming up here every Saturday for months, and who has had his hand in all this program from the beginning. I want you to know Professor Manley O. Hudson [at this time the speaker discovered that Professor Hudson had quietly left the platform]—that vacant chair is eloquent. (Laughter.) You saw him, anyhow.

Now, it is my great pleasure to introduce as Chairman of this meeting a man whom we all love. He has endeared himself to the American people and to the people of the world by his philanthropy, and his great-hearted interest in humanity.

So I am glad to introduce tonight to preside over this meeting—and we are honored in having him here to preside over the Young People's meeting of the Fourth American Peace Congress—the best loved man of this generation who is engaged in commercial life, a man who is more deeply in the hearts of the American people than any man in commercial life in the age in which we live. Mr. Andrew Carnegie. (Great applause.)

CHAIRMAN CARNEGIE:

I was not prepared for such a scene as this, and when I heard you singing I thought if the celestial choir was very much better it had gone to a good deal of unnecessary trouble. (Laughter.) I love music. Do you know what Confucius said about music? He lived five hundred years before Christ, and had to get music out of stones—not organs. He had no great musical instruments, and yet this is how he regarded music:

“Oh, music, sacred tongue of God,
I hear Thee calling,
And I come.”

What do you think of that? Two thousand years ago! No wonder I thought of the celestial choir. There is nothing else that would be suitable for expressing all that we feel of holy, sacred things. We must have music.

Then I like another thing. I think we could very easily mistake this for the celestial choir; we have so many angelic forms here dressed in white; it does seem to me that in this way to some extent we have had tonight here on earth a foretaste of heaven.

Delighted am I that I am called upon to preside and not to orate tonight, because when I get started and have my heart in it, it is doubtful what hour I may stop. So I shall not orate tonight, and I shall perform my duty as presiding officer with the thought that this visit to St. Louis has been wonderfully arranged. They made me “speechify” at the other meetings. They reserved the best for the last, and here I am exalted above all others. I consider it a great honor for one

so young to be exalted as your presiding officer. (Laughter and applause.) To show you how I shall perform my duty as presiding officer I shall now call upon the celebrated speaker of the evening, the first speaker of the evening, who has a world-wide reputation, and whom I have the greatest pleasure in introducing to you, President David Starr Jordan, of Leland Stanford, Jr., University. (Great applause.)

Manhood and War

DR. DAVID STARR JORDAN.

Greater than the waste of the "earnings of poor men's lives," is the waste of life itself. It is a fundamental fact of biology that the laws in heredity which apply to man are those which govern the lower animals as well. "Like the seed is the harvest"—this is the fundamental law. The men you breed from determine the future. Heredity runs level. No race of men nor animals has improved save through selection of the best for parentage. None has fallen save through the choice of inferior stock for parentage. Whatever influence may cause the destruction of the strong, the brave, the courageous, the enterprising, will ensure a generation which shall show these qualities in lower degree. Rome fell because the old Roman stock was for the most part banished or exterminated. There was no other cause. The Romans were gone and that was the end of it; while the sons of slaves, camp-followers, scullions and peddlers filled the Eternal City. The Republic fell when "Vir gave place to Homo," real men in Rome to mere beings. The Empire fell when the barbarians filled the unoccupied city, unoccupied so far as the men of the old Roman type was concerned.

The latest historian of the "Downfall of the Ancient World," Dr. Otto Seeck, of Münster, tells us how after the wars of Marius and Sulla, "only cowards remained, and from their brood came forward the new generations." We ask no other reason for the disappearance of Greece. Greek art, Greek philosophy, Greek literature, the perfection of form in thought, in action, in speech—all of these were impossible

save to men of Greek blood; and when these had fallen in suicidal war, there was no longer the heredity which could replace them.

Some twenty years ago, I visited the city of Novara in northern Italy. South of the town was a wheat-field where the Sardinian army was once encamped and from which they were driven by the Austrians. From the field the Sardinians fled—you can still trace their flight by the marks left by bullet and by cannon ball on the houses—down the long street to the city of Novara. Here the King, Charles Albert, sat in his palace, and when the fleeing army came by he gave up his throne to his son, Victor Emanuel. History tells the rest, but the significance of such events lies not in the fate of kings, nor does it lie in the fate of the men, nor yet in the waste of their lives, nor even in the sorrows of those who loved them. It is found in the effect upon the race.

On the battlefield of Novara the farmers had plowed up the skulls of the slain, had stacked them up until they formed a pyramid some fifteen feet high, with a little canopy which kept off the rain. These were the skulls of young men between eighteen and thirty-five years of age, young men from the farms and shops and schools, some from France, some from Italy, the rest from Austria. And as these were, according to custom, the best among the yeomanry, so in their homes since then the generations have arisen from inferior stock. By the character and fate of the common man and the opportunity offered to him, the nations must be judged. On him the fate of the nation depends, and the waste of Novara is a waste which is enduring. It is like cutting the roots of a tree while its flowers and fruitage continue. The roots of today determine the fruitage of the future. Those nations who have lost their young men in war have in so far checked their own development.

Not one Novara could work ruin to any nation. But no Novara ever stood alone. Down the road in Lombardy is the little town of Magenta. You know the color we call Magenta, the hue of the blood that flowed out under the locust trees in the park, the blood that stained the river below the hard-

fought bridge. Here the French came up from the west. In due time the Austrians fled from the bridge to the park, from the park down the long street toward Milan, and at last out of all Lombardy. Here in a cloister of the old church of Magenta you will find the pile of skulls—skulls of brave men. You can know it by the bullet holes which the spiders for half a century have vainly tried to heal.

You will go down the plains of Lombardy, eastward to Desenzano, on the Lake of Garda. Near here is the field of Solferino, bloodiest of all, where some forty thousand killed and wounded men were left by the cowardly armies for three days on the field, untended save by flies and mosquitoes. It was here that Henri Dunant of Geneva, a tourist in Verona, organized the work of relief which grew at last into the Red Cross Society. Dunant was almost the first to see a battle-field with modern eyes. To him it was not a field of glory but "a European calamity." He died at Heiden on October 31, 1910, but not until he earned the Nobel prize, not for his work for peace, but for doing his part to make war a bit more human and less horrible.

And these do not stand alone. Scarcely a town in Italy that has not some sort of a battle record. I like the frank Italian way of showing unshrinking the spoils of war.

But there are other piles and piles of skulls, none the less significant because the bones are buried. The walls of Paris tell their story, Metz, Wörth and the slaughter field of Sedan. Then we can trace our lines across Germany; Jena, Leipzig, Austerlitz—names called glorious in the history of the slaughter of young men—Lützen, Bautzen, Ulm, Wagram, Hohenlinden. Let us pass them all to recall the grand army of Moscow, 600,000 men, the finest body of men that ever stood in line. Then let us recall the blasts of winter, the burning city, the lack of base of supplies, the hatred of the people of the invaded country. And after that let us see, with the historian, the pitiful retreat of the 20,000 men who remained of this great army.

The inevitable result of all this must be the loss to the nation of the qualities which are sought for in the soldier. It

leaves the nation crippled. The effect does not appear in the effacement of art or science or creative imagination. Men who excel in these regards are not drawn by preference or by conscription to the life of the soldier. If we cut the roots of a tree, we shall not affect, for a time at least, the quality of its flower or fruit. We are limiting its future rather than changing its present. In like manner does war affect the life of the nation. It limits the future rather than checks the present.

Those who fall in war are the young men of the nations, men between the ages of eighteen and thirty-five; they are the men of courage, alertness, dash and recklessness, who value their lives as naught in the service of the nation. The men who are left are, for better and for worse, the reverse of all this, and it is they that determine what the future of the nation shall be. They hold its history in their grasp.

However noble, encouraging, inspiring the history of modern Europe may be, it is not the history we would have the right to expect from the development of its original elements. It is not the history that would have been made had these same elements been released from the shadow of reversed selection cast by fratricidal war. The angle of divergence between what might have been and what has been is measured by the parentage of strong, capable and courageous men slain on the bloody fields of glory.

All this applies not to one nation alone nor to one group of nations, but in like degree to all nations that have sent forth their young men to the field of slaughter. As it was with Greece and Rome, with France and Spain, Mauritania and Turkestan, so has it been with Germany and England; so with all nations that have sent forth "the best they breed" to foreign service, while retaining cautious, thrifty mediocrity to fill up the ranks at home.

Three million, seven hundred thousand men fell in Napoleon's campaigns. No wonder the life of Europe is impoverished. No wonder that France is a wounded nation, as are all others whose men were caught up in that holocaust. Napoleon, it was said, "has peopled hell with the élite of Europe." Stacked up on the field, as at Novara, their skulls

would make a pile thirty times as high as our own Washington monument. To this cause of reversed selection almost alone we may ascribe the social and personal deficiencies of the common folk of Europe. To be "him that overcometh" one must have a lineage made up of those who were "captains of fate" and "masters of their soul" in their day and generation. If we send forth the best we breed, there is no way by which those of the future shall be other than second best.

In the break-up of the Roman Empire, no province had a better future than Hispania, our Spain, and she, like others, had staked and lost her future in war.

"Against the credit for redeemed souls," said, in 1620, La Puente, the Augustian friar, "I set the cost of armadas and the sacrifice of soldiers and friars sent to the Philippines. And this I count the chief loss. For mines give silver and forests give timber, but only Spain gives Spaniards, and she may give so many that she may be left desolate and constrained to bring up strangers' children instead of her own."

"This is Castile," says another writer. "She makes men and wastes them." "This sublime and terrible phrase," says Captain Calkins, "sums up the whole of Spanish history."

In his charming studies of "Feudal and Modern Japan," Mr. Arthur Knapp mentions again and again the great marvel of Japan's military prowess, as shown in the Chinese War, after more than two hundred years of peace. It has been even more conclusively shown in the Russo-Japanese War since Mr. Knapp's book was written. His astonishment was that after more than six generations in which military drill was not the final aim of each young man, the virile qualities of patience and courage were found unimpaired.

In the light of the reverse of this condition which we have been considering in the case of European nations, we can readily see that the experience of Japan was just what we might expect. In times of peace there is no slaughter of the strong, no sacrifice of the brave. In the peaceful struggle for existence, there is a premium placed upon these virtues. The virile and the brave survive. They and their descendants are not wasted on the battle-field. It is the idle, the weak, and

the dissipated that go to the wall. "What won the battles on the Yalu, in Korea or Manchuria," says Professor Inazo Nitobe, "was the ghosts of our fathers guiding our hands and beating in our hearts." If we translate this from the language of Shintoism into that of science, we find it a strong testimony to the fact of race-heredity, the survival of the strong in the lives of their self-reliant and effective sons. The shades of the soldiers who fell before Napoleon are not guiding the hands or beating in the hearts of the men of Europe today.

If after two hundred years or even twenty years of incessant battle Japan should remain virile and warlike, that would indeed be a marvel. But that marvel the world has never seen. It is doubtless true that military traditions are most persistent with nations most frequently engaged in war. But military traditions and the physical strength to gain victories are very different. Other things equal, the nations which like Japan have known "the old Peace with velvet-sandaled feet" are most likely to develop the "strong battalions" on which victory in war is most likely to rest.

What now of Germany? She has had her share of the desolation and the degradation of war. It is said that in the Thirty Years' War the population of Germany was cut down from 16,000,000 to 6,000,000 people. It is said that not before 1870 was Germany able to regain the ground she held in 1618. It is, moreover, claimed that while Germany is military, she is not warlike. While there is no nation so dominated by the professional soldier with his mediæval scorn of commerce, science and all civilian things, yet there is virtually not a man in the German army who ever saw a battle. The superiority of Germany lies in its science, its industrial art, its commerce, its exaltation of all civilian activities. The evidence of the havoc of war is not so clear in Germany as in most other lands of Europe. Perhaps massacre and desolation destroyed the weak as often as the strong. Perhaps again the fact of universal compulsory education and compulsory industrial training, with compulsory insurance against old age, has greatly reduced the visible number of unemployed and of the unemployable. The factor of emigration which has filled the

great cities of the new world with young Germans, ambitious and energetic, is one which we can not estimate in comparison with the effects of war. When the best emigrate, the home lands become impoverished, but emigration gives new ideas and new experiences. The loss of one region is the gain of another, and the gain with good men overbalances the loss. The men of the new world are old-world men who have learned something in a new environment, lost something perhaps in exchange for all that is gained, but in the long run the new advantages outweigh the old. But loss which is loss comes from the sacrifice of the strong.

What shall we say of England and of her place in the history of war? In the Norse mythology, it was the Mitgard Serpent which reached around the world, swallowed its own tail and held the world together. England has made this a British world. Her young men have gone to all regions where free men can live. They have built up free institutions which rest on co-operation and compromise. She has carried the British peace to all barbarous lands and she has made it possible for civilized men to trade and pray with savages. "What does he know of England, who only England knows?" For the activities of Englishmen have been greater by manifold than within the little island from which Englishmen set forth to inherit the earth.

What has all this cost? It could not be done unless it was paid for, and we must not wonder if such strenuous effort, such sacrifice of life and force, has left her with something like exhaustion.

There's a widow in Sleepy Chester
Who mourns for her only son.
There's a grave by the Pabeng River,
A grave which the Burmans shun.

If we would know why Chester is sleepy, we have only to turn to her great cathedral. The long north side of her red sandstone walls tell of her dead, the world over, and always the same story. Tablets to the memory of young men, gentlemen's sons from Eton and Rugby and Winchester and Harrow; scholars from Oxford and Cambridge, from Manchester

and Birmingham and Liverpool, who have given up their lives in some petty war in some far-off country. Their bodies rest in India, Zululand, in Cambodia, the Gold Coast, the Transvaal. In England only are they remembered, men who should have been the makers of empire.

"It is only my dead that count,"

She said, and she says today;

"It isn't my fleet and it isn't my guns

That will sweep Trafalgar Bay."

These names are recorded by the score in every parish church, by the thousand in every cathedral, and the churches are numbered by the hundred thousand. The statement that in every parish church such tablets may be found might be questioned. As a test not long ago I chose a solitary church standing almost alone on a bleak plain in Hertfordshire, Whitchurch, once celebrated because it employed the young Handel as its organist. On opening the door I saw a tablet—"Sacred to the memory of Thomas Henry, eldest son of Thomas Hall Plumer, Esquire, of this Parish, and Lieutenant in the 49th regiment of Bengal National Infantry. He died in camp while serving at the siege of Moulton, on the 14th of December, 1848, in the 27th year of his age. His Sepoys for the love of him bore his body to the grave. This tablet was erected by his brother officers."

Other tablets told of service in India, but this met the test, and this is typical.

The foreign service of England for a hundred years has furnished careers for the sons of the squire and the gentleman. For a century Great Britain has sent her strongest and most forceful sons. "Send forth the best ye breed," and the nation breeds from the second best.

And in this loss of fair and strong, "the unreturning brave," we may find an answer to some of England's most desperate problems.

Where is the country squire of English life and English history? Where are his rosy-cheeked and strong-limbed daughters? Where, indeed, is the typical John Bull of the

time-honored cartoon? Why is it that three or four—some say eleven—millions of Englishmen are unable to earn a decent living, or any living at all, in England today? Why is it that these same unemployed are found unemployable in Canada, in Australia, or wherever they may go? Why is it that the tendency in all average physical standards is downward, while the standards of the best are growing higher? The answer lies in the reversed selection of war. Its effects are found in England and everywhere else where strength and courage have been rewarded by glory and extinction. England has exchanged her country squires for the memorial tablet. More than for all who have fallen in battle, or were wasted in the camps, England should mourn "the fair women and brave men" that should have been descendants of her strong and manly men. If we may personify the spirit of the nation, England should most grieve, not over her unreturning brave, but over those who might have been but never were, those who so long as history lasts can never be.

What shall we say of our own country, with her years of peace, and her two great civil wars, the struggle of children with their parents, of brothers with brothers?

It may be that war is sometimes justified. It is sometimes inevitable, whether necessary or not. It has happened once in our history, that "every drop of blood drawn by the lash must be drawn again by the sword."

It cost us 650,000 lives of young men to get rid of slavery. I saw not long ago in Maryland one hundred and fifty acres of these young men. There are some 12,000 acres filled with them on the fields of the South. And this number, almost a million, North and South, was the best that the nation could bring. North and South alike, the men were in dead earnest, each believing that his view of state rights and of national authority was founded on the solid rock of righteousness and fair play. North and South, the nation was impoverished by the loss. The gaps they left are filled to all appearance. There are relatively few of us left today in whose hearts the scars of forty years ago are still unhealed. But a new generation has

grown up of men and women born since the war. They have taken the nation's problems into their hands; but theirs are hands not so strong or so clean as though the men that are stood shoulder to shoulder with the men that might have been. The men that died in "the weary time" had better stuff in them than the father of the average man of today.

Those states which lost most of their strong young blood, as Virginia, Louisiana, the Carolinas, will not gain the ground they lost, not for centuries, perhaps never.

Dr. Venable, President of the University of North Carolina, told me not long ago, that one-half the alumni of that college up to 1865 were in the Civil War. One third of these were slain. We can never measure our actual loss nor determine how far the men that are fall short of the men that might have been.

The same motive, the same lesson, lasts through all ages, and it finds keen expression in the words of the wisest man of our early national history, Benjamin Franklin, "Wars are not paid for in war time: the bill comes later."

CHAIRMAN CARNEGIE:

Ladies and Gentlemen—There is a sermon for you. (Applause.) And yet we hear that the field of battle is the field of honor, and that in olden times there was only one profession of honor which a gentleman could enter and that was the army. The most misunderstood word in our language is that word "honor." We must protect our "honor," or our country may be dishonored. No man ever dishonored another. No country can ever dishonor another that does not dishonor itself. (Applause.) Another man may abuse you, or may wrong you. Therein he dishonors himself. But with the man who does no wrong, his honor remains intact. That word "honor" is the most dishonored word in our language.

Now we will have the pleasure of hearing from Professor Hudson, of the University of Missouri, upon "The Ethics of War."

The Ethics of War

PROFESSOR JAY WILLIAM HUDSON.

I suppose that a man schooled in the art of war would say that no one in his senses would dream of defending war on the ground that it makes men more "moral," or that it betters "economic conditions." He would say: "We soldiers recognize only too well that all the evils you name inevitably attend war but a nation does not go to war for the sake of these evils, but in spite of them, to avoid a greater evil, or to gain a good that counterbalances all wrongs." He would say: "It is precisely this that makes a nation heroic; it goes to war for a great cause, and is brave enough to weigh all the evils you recite and to stand for the cause in spite of them."

If this be true; if the causes of war are so sublime and the ends achieved so great as to overbalance the evils attendant upon it, I have nothing to say against a civilization of war, so long as those causes obtain and can not be justified in any other way than by force of arms. But a candid study of the wars of history does not show that their causes were of this sublime nature. The Peace Society of Massachusetts once instituted an inquiry into the actual causes of war and ascertained 231 wars of magnitude to have had the following origin: 22 for plunder or tribute; 44 for extension of territory; 24 for retaliation or revenge; 6 about disputed boundaries; 8 respecting points of honor or prerogative; 5 for the protection or extension of commerce; 41 about contested titles to crowns; 23 from jealousy of rival greatness; 28 for religion; 30 under pretense of assisting allies. The most trivial excuses have been the causes of even great wars; one nation goes to war because the enemy is beginning to get too strong; another because the enemy is so weak!

Now I will cheerfully admit that while the most of the causes of war I have just mentioned are despicable from the standpoint of enlightened reason, let alone an exalted ethics, and that therefore a civilization without them is most desirable, still some of those wars appear to be justified by reasonable causes. Instead of wars being always unreasonable it sometimes appears as the very arm by which reason itself is

enforced. It is surely rational to suppose that truth sometimes wields the sword as well as error—and needs still more vitally the sanctions of its wisely directed force. One would cite as examples of such reasonable wars those of humane intervention, or of rational self-preservation in the extending of national boundaries or of simple self-defense. These are the “just” wars which we most glorify; surely a civilization without them is hardly desirable! Are not wars that promote justice just?

In the first place, let me say that war as war, is of course not the arm of reason; it may or may not be. There is no logic in bullets and bombshells; no new light is shed on a controversy by the mere flashing of sabres. But you may say that you mean that war is reasonable not in that sense of determining any truth but in the sense of allying its mighty forces to the forcible promulgation of a great truth already determined. But I answer: If this great truth is already determined by reason, what is the use of now determining it by war? The only answer is that usually some nation has taken upon itself the right of determining singly and alone just what is reasonable; another nation or nations challenges the reasonableness of the conclusion; and then the nation which thinks it has arrived at the truth and the whole truth cries: “Go to; I will prove my very rational proposition by hitting you and stabbing you and murdering every mother’s son of you.” And forever afterward that nation glorifies that war as a “just war.” I submit that if I am sincerely anxious to proceed upon a reasonable course of conduct involving the very existence of others, I should confer with those others as to what is precisely the most rational thing for me to do. The very instrument of right reason is discussion; conference. I similarly submit that if a nation is really anxious to arrive at the great truths of international relations, if it is really depending on reason rather than force, it will be anxious and eager for international conference and will gladly abide by the result of such a high court of nations as the most reasonable thing. In other words, international law, in order to be sane and safe, must be enacted internationally by reason; not forced, even on pretenses of reasonableness by one nation on

other nations by blows. Yes, war is just "when it is the arm of reason;" but it is never the arm of reason until it is the arm of a reason attained by the majority concerned; and if a conclusion is reached by a congress of nations they have already determined the very issues of war, and war is superfluous and absurd let alone "undesirable." Force might still be necessary to enact the edicts of nations upon rebellious members of their League; but only as force is necessary to arrest the robber or hang the murderer. In other words, force would be transformed from war to the strong arm of a federated judiciary; the judiciary of a United States of the world, if you please. I say the "United States of the World" advisedly; for this democracy of the United States of "America," a union of the States at perfect peace, who now decide all common questions by a common appeal to a common reason; I say that this union is the age's pledge and prophecy of the universal union and the universal peace!

The argument just presented easily identifies a civilization of perfect reason with a civilization without war; and since we assumed in the first instance that a civilization of perfect reason is of all things to be wished for, we might now legitimately conclude that a civilization without war is desirable. I have already described some of the evils which such a civilization would forever avoid; I have mentioned none of its positive benefits to mankind. I said that civilization had always been spread by wars; but I might have added, "always badly spread;" and that wars never do this as a purpose but only as a pretext; and even then destroy even more than they build upon their ruins. War, not the Violence of Time, destroyed the greatest library of ancient times, the Alexandrian; war it was that shattered the proudest monuments of Egypt, Babylon and Rome; by the blasphemy of war was the Parthenon of Athens ravished in one fearful night; the most glorious remembrance of the grandeur that was Greece. On the other hand, the very business of a civilization of peace, with its world-wide commerce, its ocean cables, its telegraphs and railroads and its million printing presses, is the quiet and certain spread of culture. War only could perform this mis-

sion once; war only can thwart and endlessly retard this mission now.

Again, while I admire the heroic qualities which war brings forth, I am not quite sure that if war is to be nourished for the sake of the virtues of perseverance and undaunted bravery, we had not better nourish war in our families, in our clubs everywhere; the more war, the more virtue. The fact is, that even as historic warfare rather than peace has called out personal heroic traits, it has been due to the peculiar conditions of its waging in the past—conditions which have been absolutely superseded by the methods and means of modern war. Col. Maurice declares in his book on "War:" "The armies which have to be led under these new circumstances have themselves been profoundly changed; not only in their armament, but in the very spirit, discipline and organization by which they are held together." There is room on the other hand for sublimer heroisms in a civilization of peace; heroisms which render those of war all but trifling. The world calls for a new kind of heroes—heroes to combat quietly and manfully with the wants and struggles of a race which confronts social problems of a magnitude to try the bravest hearts; intellectual heroes, moral heroes, heroes of philosophy, heroes of science; heroes who shall have no brass bands and drums and glad cheers to lead them on, and so greater heroes than days of war ever knew. The combative instinct will not die out, it is the palladium of personal dignity; but it will not be a combat of swords, but of principles; not on the field of Mars, but on the field of Moral majesties. Yea, all the virtues of war will not only flourish in peace, but only then be truly realized; and a brand new virtue will be born—the virtue which is peculiarly man's own but which as long as force was supreme he never completely claimed, the virtue of rationality. Think of a man's intellectual progress in a civilization where all problems will have to be solved with brains rather than settled by blows. Do away with force as an ultimate appeal and the race must, in self-defense, become a race of philosophers—and imagine, if you will, what a difference that would make in private and public life; in the arts and institutions of the world! And since good reason is always

at the basis of good ethics, men would be truly and wisely good for the first time in their troublous history.

I am as sensible as you are that I have been picturing an ideal, but my business was to portray "desirabilities." I am not among those infatuated agitators for peace who would have us, at this day, practice the absurd Tolstoian policy of non-resistance. That would be suicide. Until a considerable number of the powers once and for all agree to submit international issues to a mutual court of rational appeal, war is not only necessary, but desirable to protect obvious rights and to maintain in the larger sense the "balance of power." But that does not make such an international agreement less desirable, but rather more so, together with the golden age such a covenant would bring.

Toward this ideal, history's greatest movements and history's greatest men unerringly lead. It is the spirit even of Plato and it is the gospel of the Nazarene. "You say all history is the record of war?" says Emerson. "I say no! All history is a record of the decline of war." These modern habits of international co-operation; the peaceful and cordial meetings of immense international, educational, scientific, and religious associations in all the great capitals of Christendom; these new and lasting bonds by which a new learning and a newborn art have bound together the interests of all races makes war look more and more like fratricide and plain murder. "And," says Jos. McCabe, "not the least of these modern transformations in the direction of peace is the advent of Woman into a direct and vital influence on public affairs;" an influence of refinement, sensitiveness and sympathy which opposes with all its moral force the ethics of combat and of blood.

CHAIRMAN CARNEGIE:

One phase of the subject our speakers did not deal with I think merits a word. I knew two men, residents of St. Louis, General Grant and General Sherman, and often met them and talked with them in New York. They knew what war was. General Grant was offered a naval review when he was in London and he declined, saying: "I never want to look upon

a regiment of soldiers again." General Sherman in nine letters solved the whole question: "War is hell." We must remember that the human race progresses; that man is born with an instinct for his development, and that the past is not to be considered, but the present. Can the man who hires himself out to kill his fellowman for so much a month, as he is told to do by his commanders be called a developed man? I think he is behind his age. There is where I think the dishonor comes in. True, we may have a small armed force to preserve order among ourselves. I think we will soon do without that, and that the one army we shall have will be the militia that can be called out in times of disorder, if ever any such time comes in the future, which I very much doubt. I think the human race in America is educated, and has outgrown the age of war; they realize now as they never did before that the man who kills his fellowman in battle as a means of settling disputes remains barbaric. We have no claim to civilization until we banish from the earth the killing of man by man. That is my doctrine about war. Now I have great pleasure in informing you that we are about to sing a song that has no war in it—"America;" "My Country, 'tis of Thee!"

[After the singing of "America," Dr. W. W. King pronounced the benediction.]

FIFTH GENERAL SESSION

A CENTURY OF ANGLO-AMERICAN PEACE

Saturday Morning, May 3, at 10 o'clock

THE ODEON

HON. THEODORE E. BURTON, Presiding

PRESIDENT BARTHOLDT:

Your presiding officer at this morning session will be a gentleman whose name is a household word with the peace forces of the United States. He is a member of the United States Senate and we are all glad to see him here. He is one of those members of the United States Senate who voted to ratify without a single change the great arbitration treaties proposed by President Taft. I now take great pleasure in presenting to you the Honorable Theodore E. Burton, United States Senator from Ohio.

SENATOR BURTON:

The American Peace Congress would not be complete without a discussion of the proposed centennial celebration of one hundred years of peace between the United States and Great Britain. The condition of the border between the United States and Canada is an example to the world of peaceful relations, of orderly development of friendship between those of different nations. A border on which for thousands of miles there are not fortifications. In the closing years of the Continental Congress Alexander Hamilton proposed that it be a part of the definite treaty between the United States and Great Britain that there be no warships on the Great Lakes. That was one of the ideas of this great constructive statesman who had so much to do with the forming of American policies in the early days of our history. That idea of his has been substantially carried out by the agreement of 1817, and it should be with real rejoicing on the

part of the friends of peace that we look forward to this celebration in the year 1915. (Applause.) I am glad to know that we have with us gentlemen from Canada who will join with us in the discussion of this subject. I take pleasure in introducing to you first Honorable Benjamin Russell, Judge of the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia, who will now address you.

Anglo-American Obligations in Maintaining Peace

HON. BENJAMIN RUSSELL.

I hope you will indulge me while I make a little personal reference to explain the alacrity with which I responded to the invitation to take part in this Congress. My grandfather left your country between a hundred and a hundred and fifty years ago because a feeling of loyalty to the political conditions under which he was born outweighed any sense of oppression under which he consciously suffered. A brother born under the same roof remained in your country, conducted an influential journal in the city of Boston under the new government and printed the laws of the State of Massachusetts for nothing because they were too poor to pay the printer's bill, which was, however, honorably liquidated at a later date. He lived and died an ardent and enthusiastic supporter of the Republic, and was buried in the old Granary graveyard, where the inscription upon his tombstone is still to be read. I have never been able, although I have read much and pondered long upon the subject, to make up my mind whether, had I been living in those eventful years, I should have adopted the course of my grandfather, or followed, as did his brother, the standard of Adams and Hancock. And my perplexity is increased when I find historians of the first rank in this country, honorable and patriotic Americans, presenting a magnanimous apology for, if not a full vindication of, the proceedings of the Mother Country, while English historians, such as Trevelyan in his history of the American Revolution, champion without qualification or reserve the conduct of the revolutionary leaders. It is surely one of the most hopeful and encouraging signs of the times

when we can begin, each party to the great anniversary, to look dispassionately at the case of the other party and enter with sympathetic consideration into the feelings that governed the conduct of the adversary. The questions then at issue have been long since settled and forgotten, but a rapid survey of the subsequent events will not be out of place as a preliminary to a consideration of our present conditions and our hopes for the future of the race.

The war of the Revolution, of course, left behind it many bitter memories and opened up many new occasions of misunderstanding. The hostile feelings and bitter estrangements in which that struggle had its origin and which its progress still further intensified, had no opportunity to die away before fresh occasions of dispute and controversy were presented by England's measures of retaliation against the Berlin and Milan decrees of the great Napoleon. Those measures were absolutely justifiable and even inevitable as measures of self-preservation, but they threatened the expanding commerce of the United States with annihilation, and the irritation and resentment in this country naturally consequent upon the measures of the belligerents were still further intensified by the assertion of a right to search under which both belligerents claimed the right to take seamen out of the vessels of the United States. "England," said Jefferson, with reference to the incidents attending the assertion of this right, "seems to have become a den of pirates and France a den of thieves." Causes such as these sufficiently account for the war of 1812, which was happily terminated by the treaty of Ghent in 1814, the coming centennial of which is attracting the attention of English-speaking peoples throughout the world. It is true that a full quarter of a century elapsed before the peace of the two nations was disturbed or seriously threatened. But during all this quarter of a century of nominal and formal peace, causes of discord that might any day ripen into a harvest of bloodshed were left to their possible operation. The line of division between the United States and the British Dominion north of them remained unsettled, and while it so remained with all its possibilities of mischief, an event occurred which added fresh fuel to the smouldering mass of

national antipathies. The Canadian rebellion naturally evoked the sympathies of a people who had only fifty years before conducted a successful rebellion against the same sovereignty and a number of them chartered a steamer to be employed in furnishing stores to a body of insurgents who had taken possession of a small island above the falls of Niagara. The *Caroline* was seized by a zealous British officer, but unfortunately she was taken in American waters and sent blazing over the falls of Niagara. This untoward event was followed a few years later by the unfortunate folly of a Canadian citizen who boasted when on a visit to New York of having taken part in the attack on the *Caroline*, and thus subjected himself to arrest and trial for the murder of an American citizen who had lost his life on the occasion. Lord Palmerston, whose temperament in international matters was largely that of the modern jingo, declared that the conviction of the Canadian for murder would certainly be followed by an immediate declaration of war, but the tragedy was happily averted by a most opportune verdict of acquittal. Then came the invention of the new doctrine of a right to visit, which seems to have been a necessity to prevent the escape of vessels participating in the slave trade, contrary to the terms of the treaty to which their own government had subscribed, by fraudulently displaying the flag of the United States which had declined to become a party to the convention. By the *Ashburton* treaty of 1842 this controversy was set at rest with the abandonment of the right to visit, and the *Maine* boundary was settled by a compromise which has ever since been a trouble and a bewilderment to the governments of Canada. The *Ashburton* treaty was never a topic upon which a Canadian could express his feelings within the Ten Commandments, but the historian of the foreign relations of England tells us that the British people approved of the conciliatory tone that Lord *Ashburton* used and that peace was firmly established between the United States and England. The appearance of a firmly established peace was, however, an illusion. Hardly had the controversy over the eastern boundary been settled, when a new and still wider boundary question was opened up, involving an immense area of western territory claimed by both England

and the United States, the rights with respect to which were not determined until after the contending parties had disputed within measurable distance of actual war.

It will be seen from this hasty, and, I fear a little tedious outline, that at no time from the Revolution to the breaking out of the Civil War was there a period when the great majority, not of old men only, but of the middle-aged inhabitants of the United States, could not look back, either to actual hostilities or to a state of things hardly less disturbing than that of actual conflict as conditions existed in their own lifetime. Then came the Civil War, with all its attendant and consequent misunderstandings and resentments. Mr. Gladstone's precipitate hailing of the appearance of the Southern Confederacy as a new and welcome member of the family of nations, the unfortunate arrest of the agents of the Confederacy by Captain Wilkes from the deck of a British mail packet, the dispatch of troops to Canada, which seemed too much like an attempt to make America's extremity England's opportunity, the series of accidents, genuine accidents I verily believe, but which had all the outward appearance of deliberation and design, by which the Alabama—to borrow the stately measures of Charles Sumner's memorable quotation from Milton—

“that perfidious bark,
Built in the eclipse and rigged with curses dark.”

was let loose from her moorings to prey upon the commerce of the north, which created an intensity of bitterness which found expression years later in the tremendous arraignment of English policy throughout the Civil War by Charles Sumner in the American Senate, which perhaps for the first time opened the eyes of British statesmen and of the public of England to the gravity of the situation that had been created.

Who can wonder if there were strained relations when we recall the long series of irritating questions that presented themselves within the hundred years that have gone by? The wonder is, and the cause for devout thankfulness is, that with such frequent and abundant causes for estrangement there

has always been such a reserve force of common sense and Christian feeling on both sides of the Atlantic that there has been no clash of arms over controversies, which, had they presented themselves between any two nations of continental Europe, must have ended in a disastrous war.

Those days have happily gone by. We have reached a condition to which might well be applied the phrase that has been consecrated in American history to describe the presidency of James Monroe as the "era of good feeling." Controversies of the past awaken no resentment. They are remembered only to evoke our gratitude for their happy solution. The ocean now, to borrow again the stately verse of Milton—

"hath quite forgot to rave

While birds of calm sit brooding on the charmed wave."

But what of the future, and what have we to say as to the duties devolving upon us in the immediate present? I take it that the people of these two great democracies have arrived at the conclusion that no question can ever possibly come between them that may not be settled without resort to the barbarous arbitrament of the sword. That being so, surely it is our first duty to formulate this resolve in a treaty from which there need be no excluded cases. Why should any matter of controversy be excluded from the cognizance of an international tribunal? Questions affecting the honor of the nation! Why of all others, those are peculiarly the questions that should be referred to the arbitrament of some impartial tribunal. How can one's honor be forfeited by his loyal submission to the judgment of the arbiter to whom he has committed his case? And what can ever be more intrinsically dishonorable than for the party to a controversy to act as a judge in his own cause? When you analyze this conception of honor it is the same old spurious notion of honor that in the last century compelled a man at the penalty of disgrace and ostracism to present his body as a target for the pistol of the duelist, that sent your most constructive statesman, the one to whom perhaps you owe more than to any other for the consolidation of your national fabric—that sent Alexander

Hamilton to an untimely grave to satisfy the honor of Aaron Burr. Who would ever think in these days that "honor" demanded such a sacrifice as that? And yet while we would shrink with horror from the thought of a single life being sacrificed on the altar of a spurious honor, there are those who would actually go out of their way to create opportunities for the sacrifice of thousands and hundreds of thousands of precious lives for a spurious notion of national honor that needs no vindication. Again I say there can be no question so difficult or so perplexing between these two nations that it may not safely be entrusted to an arbitral tribunal. There never will in the future be any controversy between my country and yours that will evoke a more passionate feeling of resentment than the questions arising out of the escape of the Alabama, and there never will be a decision given by any international court that will create a more intense disappointment and vexation on our side of the line than the Yukon boundary award. The unsuccessful suitor in the Province of Quebec, I have been told, is given a week to curse the court. This is a privilege of which we freely availed ourselves in Canada on the publication of the Yukon award, as also on the earlier occasion of the Ashburton treaty. I do not myself say that in either of these instances essential justice was not done. On the contrary, one of my learned brethren of the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia, delivered a short time ago a lecture in which he seemed to prove conclusively that in both of these cases, although the proceedings were bitterly resented at the time by the people of Canada, the results were in accordance with the requirements of international justice. But however this may be, of one thing I am certain, that there is not a rational man in the Dominion of Canada today who will not say that if the results in these cases had been even more injurious to the interests of the Dominion or the Empire than they were considered by their most vehement critics, they were not still preferable to the most successful war that could have been waged over the controversies.

I am glad to know that in the opinion of this Congress, a war between these two countries on any conceivable cause of dispute, has become a practical impossibility. I should

like to be able to agree with Mr. Mead, who spoke so interestingly upon the subject the other evening, that the same thing was true as to the question of war between England and Germany. I believe the same thing would be true if the German people in the fatherland had the same grip of their national affairs as the Germans who have become citizens of this great commonwealth. But I fear that there is too much truth in the statements of Mr. Price Collier in a recent series of articles, in the course of which he says that the German at home leaves all such questions of international concern in the hands of his Emperor, and, while the Emperor has proven himself to be a man of peace and has preserved the peace of Europe for forty years, he has an unfortunate trick of occasionally brandishing the sabre in a very irritating and menacing manner that does not always make for the best in international relations. If such questions were left to be determined by the feelings of the German people, war between England and Germany would be as impossible as a war between the United States and England, but so long as the present competition in preparations for war is allowed to continue, I can not feel assured as I should like to feel for the continuance of peaceful relations between these two great powers. We can only hope for the best and work for the best. I believe that the good offices of the United States could be very influentially exerted in this direction, and that the time may come when the governing powers in both of those great nations will bring it about that a resort to arms, which would be disastrous to them both, will be as unthinkable as a war between your country and mine.

In the meantime, surely it is our duty to hold aloft the ideals that have been so eloquently spoken for at this Congress, to seek peace and ensure it, to forget all past occasions of controversy, to reduce our future controversies to the minimum, and to take measures to provide in all possible events for the peaceful solution. May God grant that these two great and powerful nations, the one with its vast aggregation of self-governing commonwealths, having by its federal system solved the problem of combining local self-government with central control, the other with its flourishing colonies in

every clime and under every sky, having harmonized the most absolute and perfect local autonomy with an unquestioned and unquestionable loyalty to a throne and sovereignty "broad based upon a people's will and compassed by the inviolate sea" may ever be found laboring in an indissoluble and happy union of heart and hand for the vindication of the rights of humanity and the enlightenment and civilization of the world.

SENATOR BURTON:

I am sure that we have all listened with a great deal of enjoyment and profit to Judge Russell's very able address. The lesson to be derived from it is this: So many controversies have been settled between the United States on the one hand and Canada and Great Britain on the other during the last hundred years, how much easier it should be with the advanced sentiment of these years of the twentieth century to settle all causes of controversy between the two countries amicably and justly. I can not stop with the hope that we shall have an arbitration treaty merely with Great Britain. My hope extends to all countries of the world as well. There is a special reason because we are so well acquainted with Great Britain, because so large an area is immediately on our northern border; but the same beneficent growth of spirit of peace should cause us to enter into similar undertakings with every nation. There is present with us today Mr. Andrew B. Humphrey who has had charge of the arrangements for the celebration of the centennial. He will tell you of the plans for its celebration. I now take pleasure in introducing Mr. Humphrey.

[The address of Mr. Humphrey detailed the plans so far as they had progressed for the celebration of the Anglo-American Peace Centennial.]

SENATOR BURTON:

I am sure that the interest of all of us in this proposed celebration has been greatly stimulated by Mr. Humphrey's address. There has been a certain amount of absurd opposition to this idea of a celebration. I sincerely hope that the influence of all present at this Congress may be exerted to do

away with that opposition. Not only is the celebration very important in itself, but very important results will naturally follow from it. We have with us a gentleman who comes from the Province of Ontario, one perhaps most nearly in touch with the United States and of which we know most. He is the Editor of the Toronto Star. I take pleasure in introducing Mr. John Lewis, who will now address you.

The Identity of Interests of the United States and Canada

JOHN LEWIS, of the Toronto Star.

A year ago I had the pleasure of addressing a meeting at Lake Mohonk. On my return a friendly critic asked, "What's the use of talking to the people at Lake Mohonk about peace? Everybody there wants peace."

Being a teachable as well as a peaceable man, I took the hint. I did some writing for peace in Canada. Down came another critic and asked, "What's the use of preaching peace in Canada or in the United States where all the people are peaceful. Why don't you talk to those war-like Europeans?"

I could not go to Europe, but I followed the fortunes of some who did. Mr. Norman Angell was preaching his well-known doctrines in England, and this is how a war-like journal talked to him: "If this Mr. Norman Angell is sincerely devoted to Great Britain, why should he not take a turn in Germany and America, where far more bellicose views prevail than in this country? Why should he concentrate himself on endeavoring to quench the feeble and flickering flame of patriotism which needs the utmost care and nursing, if Great Britain is to keep her place among the great powers?"

Well, let us visit Germany with the correspondent of the London Daily Mail. He says the Germans are not jingos, but they have the jumps. They think that their neighbors are preparing to attack them and they are especially suspicious of France.

Then this same writer visited France. There he heard Frenchmen saying they had no idea of attacking Germany, but required a strong French army to preserve the peace.

That is what they all say. They all want peace but are afraid they will be forced to fight. Surely Europe is a curious place—composed entirely of lambs surrounded by ravening wolves—of pacific nations girded by relentless foes.

You see my friend who criticized me for talking peace in Lake Mohonk started me on a strange journey. Yet I will take his advice so far as not to talk generalities in favor of peace at a meeting of persons who are already persuaded. I hope to make some suggestion that will advance the cause we have at heart.

We have had between Canada and the United States nearly a century of peace. We propose to celebrate that anniversary. We want something more than a show. We want something more than a mere expression of satisfaction with ourselves.

We must know first what is the cause of this long reign of peace. We must know in the second place how we can use the progress we have made in order to move onward and upward to greater heights. We must know what foundation has been laid; how we can broaden and strengthen that foundation and what structure we will build upon it in the next hundred years and in the far-distant future.

First, then, as to the cause of this peace of a hundred years. I agree with all that has been said as to the results and the benefits of arbitration. Others may have a special study of that question. I shall say nothing further than this. Arbitration is at once a cause and an effect. It is a source of peace. It is also the effect of a certain attitude of mind, a certain inclination of heart. You must have the desire to arbitrate, which means the desire for peace and friendship. Your arbitration in its turn will promote peace and friendship. But it is that desire for friendly relations, that attitude of mind of which I desire to speak.

You have heard it said that we are agreed because we are all Anglo-Saxons or anglo-somethings—because we all speak English or something resembling English—because there are ties of race and blood and common traditions which unite the British and American people.

Frankly, I am not enthusiastic about that bond. In the first place the Anglo-Saxon idea of unity excludes two million of my fellow citizens—the French Canadians—for whom I have the strongest admiration and the deepest affection.

In the second place, that bond of race and language gives us no help in our effort to extend this North American idea all over the world. It offers us no means of union with those who have the misfortune to belong to other races, and who perversely insist upon speaking French or German or Italian.

I do not deny that this community of race and language has helped us. It has broken down one barrier. But that is only the beginning. It means that we have gained the point where we can batter down other walls of prejudice. We need a bond of union which will unite people of all races and languages and colors and creeds. We need clearness of vision to see that these differences may be not only harmless but full of help and strength—may be aids to the full and free development of all that is best in humanity.

So in trying to discover the foundation of peace and friendship between Canada and the United States and to keep that foundation broad and strong, I find myself driven to the most obvious ground; that Canada is a community of men, women and children; and that your republic is a community of men, women and children. Let us not be satisfied with any foundation that is not as broad as humanity.

I am assigned in this program to speak on the identity of the interests of the United States and Canada. But I go much further than that. My contention is that the highest and best interests of all the nations of the world are identical because the best and highest interests of all the men, women and children in the world are identical. The highest ideals of all the nations of the world if not identical are not conflicting, but helpful one to the other.

How then shall we broaden this foundation? What structure shall we build upon it? First, we desire to see this condition of peace prevail not only in North America, but all over the world. Instead of copying European militarism the new world should show the old a better way.

Second, we should not be satisfied with peace as a mere negative and passive thing, but go on to active and ever-increasing co-operation, and ever-growing friendship among the nations of the world. I would like to see inscribed on some monument connected with this anniversary a legend dealing with the past, the present and the future. It might read thus:

The year 1814 war.

The year 1914 peace.

The year 2014 warm friendship and active co-operation.

Now I come back to my proposition that the best interests of all nations are identical. Take the matter of government. It is the interest of every nation that every other nation be well governed. By that I mean, looking beyond the form of government to the substance, that there should be order and freedom and substantial justice and regard for human rights. By bad government I mean, not defects which are inevitable in all human institutions, but despotism, anarchy, flagrant disregard of justice, outrageous tyranny, oppression that makes men mad. These create danger for the nation so afflicted and for others.

Let me refer on this point to the Balkan War. You may remember that when that war broke out it was said that the arguments of the peace men had been demolished and all their hopes blasted. Mr. Norman Angell said that his friends were too polite even to mention the Balkan War in his presence.

This illustrates how curiously people misunderstand the peace movement and the ideas of its workers. I have not the least doubt of the final triumph of our cause. But I never supposed, and I never met any peace man who supposed, that war would be abolished in this year or in this decade.

But more than that, so far from this Balkan War being a surprise to the poor innocent visionaries of the peace movement, that war was almost predicted—at least its causes were clearly stated in advance in the Third American Peace Congress at Baltimore in 1911.

In the addresses of Mr. Theodore Marburg, Mr. Talcott Williams and Mr. Hamilton Holt you will find it laid down that the great source of war today is found in governments

that do not exercise complete control over their people; that the injustice and oppression practiced by Turkey had exposed that country to attack; that there was a degree of misgovernment which might become a subject of international discussion and world-wide anxiety and possibly lead to war.

Turkey certainly did not suffer because she was not militarist enough. Her people were brave, her soldiers were trained by German officers and supplied with modern weapons. She suffered not because she lacked military spirit, but because she was too military. The historian says Turkey could conquer but could not govern.

Nothing could be more absurd than a picture of Turkey as a nation devoted to peaceful industry suddenly attacked by war-like neighbors, and thus offering a terrible warning to such industrial nations as Great Britain and the United States.

The real lesson of the Balkan situation is this: All the great powers of Europe recognize that misgovernment in the Balkan region is a source of danger to the whole continent and that good government would be a guarantee of peace. In short, it is recognized that every nation in Europe is interested not only in its own government but in the good government of all its neighbors.

Consider for a moment the question of fiscal policy. Your congress is now at work revising your tariff. What is our interest as Canadians in that revision? It is absolutely identical with your interest in the United States. We have no interest except that you will do what is best for yourselves; not only because we are friends, but because whatever helps you—whatever is in your own best and highest interests—must help Canada and must help the world.

I have never taken the slightest interest in the old controversy whether the consumer or the producer pays the duty. Both are hurt by taxes on trade; and both are helped by the removal of taxes on trade. If the Canadian duty is removed it helps the consumer in my country; and if it helps the producer in some other country so much the better.

I shall not discuss further the identity of material interests, such as finance, a question which has been so fully and ably dealt with by Mr. Norman Angell.

But we are told that even if the material interests of nations are identical there will still be war. Man does not live by bread alone. There are ideals for which he lives and works and fights. And then our military friends present us with an awe-inspiring picture of a Teutonic ideal clashing with a Latin ideal, or a pan-Germanic ideal with a pan-Slavic ideal. As a result of this conflict you have the long-expected battle of Armageddon.

Now I yield to no man in my regard for ideals. But I might differ with some as to what constitutes an ideal. "Ideal" is not the word I should apply to a craze or a crime. We do not say of a man who thinks his head is made of glass that he has ideals which his friends do not understand. We do not say of a man who wants to kill or rob his neighbor that he has ideals which though magnificent conflict with those of his would-be victim. It is not ideals but crazes and prejudices and criminal tendencies which are the fruitful sources of war.

I do not care whether the matter is placed upon the ground of material interest or upon the ground of the highest ideals. If nations will consider their material interests there will be no war. If nations will follow their highest and best ideals there will be no war.

For an example of an absolutely wrong-headed idea closely associated with militarist notions, take the old contempt for agriculture—the contempt which finds expression in such nicknames as Rube and Hayseed. Then take by way of contrast the modern idea of raising agriculture to the dignity of a profession, or rather recognizing its inherent dignity.

The importance of that movement, the establishment of agricultural colleges and agricultural courses in universities, the departments of agriculture in our various governments—all this has a much deeper significance than an increase in the production of food and the profits of farming. It represents an ideal of civilization—the exaltation of a useful constructive calling diametrically opposed to the glorification of war.

I would suggest that this elevation of peaceful industry to its true place should be emphasized and symbolized in our anniversary celebration. We have on our side of the line, as

you have on yours, exhibitions of the achievements of science and industry in agriculture, manufactures and all the arts of peace. It would be a simple matter to turn everyone of these into a part of the anniversary celebration. Again on both sides of the line the first Monday in September is a holiday known as Labor Day. Why should not this day, say in 1914, be converted into a demonstration of the unity of the interests of labor all over Canada and the United States?

I ask you to apply a practical test to this notion that war may come through conflicting national ideals. Take any ideal you please. Think of any great boon which as a patriotic American you would like to confer upon your country. Ask yourself whether the pursuit of that ideal is likely to involve your country in war.

Suppose your ideal is a great American literature, dramas greater than Shakespeare's, epic poems surpassing the *Iliad* or *Paradise Lost*. Is that likely to involve your country in war?

Suppose your ambition is to have the United States a musical nation surpassing Germany. Will that involve international complications? Will any ideal connected with arts and letters bring down upon you the armed hosts of Europe or Asia?

Or suppose your aims are social, philanthropic, moral or spiritual. You aim to conserve the resources of the United States; to increase the fertility of the soil; to make your cities beautiful, clean, healthful, with playgrounds for children, with sanitary and spacious dwellings, with noble architecture, with ample police protection. Will that involve you in war with any other nation?

Suppose your ideal is the finest system of education in the world, giving full development to every body and soul in the United States.

Suppose you work against poverty, crime and disease. Suppose you seek cures for tuberculosis and cancer, for the white plague, and its twin brother in the moral world, white slavery.

Will the pursuit of any of these ideals lead to war? No. On the contrary, it will bring you into friendly associations

with the keenest intellects and the warmest hearts of all the nations of the earth. They will teach you. They will learn from you. It is this sympathy, this desire for co-operation in work for humanity that creates the international congresses and conferences on hygiene, on white slavery, on social reform. These are the beginnings of the parliament of man.

It is just here that I see the hope of that era of friendship and co-operation which is to follow our century of peace.

I wonder whether in the coming celebration the art of the sculptor, the genius of the poet, the skill of the organizer of pageants, could symbolize and body forth the idea which I can so imperfectly express.

Could we present to the world and to future generations the picture of two nations, or of all nations, not resting, but working together—yes—and fighting together against the common enemies of mankind?

Militarists tell us that life is not worth living without effort and struggle. They are right in that. But they are wrong in their conception of the fight and of the enemy. The enemy is not another nation, composed of men, women and children like ourselves. The enemy is such a pestilence as white slavery, and in that war humanity will find full scope for its love of effort and its healthy fighting spirit.

Could we symbolize in our celebration the heroisms of peace—the heroism of the pioneers who laid the foundation of the greatness of my country and of yours—the heroism of firemen—the heroism of the men who work in our mines—who forge our great structures of steel—who sail our great ships—who carry our trains across the continent—men who for our sake live and labor under conditions of hardship and danger?

Could our sculptors or poets foreshadow the new era that will dawn upon mankind when all the virtues that are now called forth by war or calamity—the courage—the comradeship—the self-sacrifice—will be devoted every hour to the service of humanity? We have yet no true conception of the real powers of the human mind or of the human heart. When by the co-operation of the nations these powers are developed

and used we shall find that the golden age is not in the past but is our own.

We who belong to peace societies and take part in these conferences are not the only workers for peace. Many are working in that cause who might even disclaim the name of peace-men. All the social reformers are on our side. All the forces of civilization are on our side. The change in the spirit of diplomacy is on our side. Upon that subject I would like to say a few words.

We recognize today that modern diplomacy is an aid to peace. The foreign secretary of Great Britain, your own Secretary of State, your ambassadors and ministers are all charged with the duty of maintaining good relations. That is a modern and democratic conception of diplomacy, and it represents a most important gain for the cause of peace.

What was the old conception? It was based upon the idea that one race or nation was the natural enemy of the other. Hence the position of ambassador in a foreign court was like that of a spy in a hostile army. He was expected to pick up scraps of gossip in the unguarded moments of social intercourse. "For this end," says one writer, "good cheer and the warming effects of wine are excellent allies." Another writer described an ambassador as a man "sent to lie abroad for the good of his country."

Democracy has changed all that, and changed it for the better. The ambassador now represents not only the sovereign to the sovereign, but the nation to the nation. It is his duty to make each nation understand the other. We know how well that duty has been discharged by such men as Mr. Bryce in Washington, and Mr. Whitelaw Reid in London.

So your Secretary of State, whose duties relate largely to foreign affairs, regards himself as charged with the duty of promoting friendly relations, not only with the United States, but among all nations. The keeping of the peace is recognized as one of the functions of government, with its own department and its staff of officials.

So far has democracy carried us. But may we not go farther? Is it not the fact that in countries popularly governed every man is charged with diplomatic duties and is

bound to do his best to preserve good relations and promote friendship with every nation upon earth?

Take first my own calling. Newspapers have been accused of making wars. They can do much to improve international relations or to make them worse. They can insult foreign nations or treat them with courtesy. They can inflame or quench the passions and prejudices of their own readers. So every newspaper is virtually in the diplomatic service of its country whether its work be done well or ill.

But that duty is not ours alone. It rests upon every citizen of your country and mine. The intercourse of nations is mainly among private citizens. Out of ten thousand people who come to your country one will see the secretary of state or some one in his service. The rest of the ten thousand will meet your customs officials, your railway conductors, your policemen, your merchants; and by their conduct they will judge the United States. Every one of these is therefore charged with diplomatic duties, and has the honor of his country in his keeping. So it is with my own country and with every country in the world, especially with those in which democracy prevails.

Take again the army of travelers who go abroad from your country and from mine. Every one is an agent of his country. For one person who sees the accredited ambassador ten thousand see the ordinary traveler and by him and by his manners they judge the country.

Now if every traveler is really an ambassador and if every citizen at home who meets a traveler from abroad represents his country; might not our cause be furthered by a clearer recognition of that duty? When I am at home I am the host; the traveler is the guest of my country and I am bound to treat him with courtesy and hospitality.

When I travel in a foreign country I am the guest of that country and the representative of my own, and am bound to maintain the dignity and courtesy belonging to that honorable office. I ought to feel it also my duty to bring home from the foreign country some useful ideas—not to spy but to observe men and manners, to study various civilizations and to broaden my own mind and that of my countrymen.

In time of war we are told that it is our duty to stand behind the government. In time of peace is it not equally our duty to stand behind that department of the government which is charged with the maintenance of peace?

Finally, we might mark this celebration by a broader conception of patriotism. In the mind of many you find the word patriotism connected with war. But in Scott's famous patriotic poem "Breathes there a man," etc., the patriot is contrasted not with the man of cosmopolitan sympathy, but with the "wretch centered all in self." The patriot is the man who has got out of himself and devoted himself to his country. So a man is a patriot who is an honest mechanic, an honest merchant, an earnest social reformer, a good citizen.

It is patriotic to abolish slums and to open playgrounds for children. You have a local patriotism, a patriotism for St. Louis, a patriotism for Missouri, a patriotism for the United States. If we can extend our patriotism over such vast areas as Canada, the United States and the British Empire, why not over the whole world? We are moving toward that larger patriotism, toward a recognition of our citizenship of the world and our duty to the human race.

SENATOR BURTON:

I am sure we are all in hearty sympathy with the generous cosmopolitan spirit in the address of Mr. Lewis and for his analysis of the proper international spirit. The program gives next the report of the Committee on Resolutions. I understand there is to be a change in the order and invitations may be extended for the next meeting of the Congress. I recognize Dr. David Starr Jordan.

DR. JORDAN:

I have been made chairman of a committee in California and the purpose of this committee is to ask the Peace Congress to meet for the next time in 1915 at San Francisco. You understand that we have a great world exposition there in honor of the opening of the Panama Canal. You understand that California is extremely hospitable. You understand that California is the region of all regions on earth where men

have the most individualistic opinions and express them the most freely. Two Californians sometimes agree, but three never. Therefore, there is very special need that you should come to California because California needs you as a unifying element and on the other hand you need California as a disturbing element, as an element to lead you to look at things in different ways from what you have looked at them before. And besides it is the most beautiful country in the world. It is the one region where the people love their country because California has loved us. It is the region where the climate is never in one's way. The climate is our friend always. The scenery is always beautiful no matter where you may go, and there is still plenty of elbow room. You want to see all those things and so you want to come for your next meeting to San Francisco in 1915. I shall not make any long speech. The secretary of this committee, Mr. Root, representing the California Branch of the American Peace Society, has some more formal remarks than these I have made, but you understand that California needs you and you need California. (Applause.)

SENATOR BURTON:

Mr. Root.

MR. ROOT:

I hold in my hand a formal invitation of the officials of the Panama-Pacific Exposition of San Francisco inviting each one of you and all your friends to come to San Francisco in 1915, not only to attend the Exposition and enjoy the satisfaction of a visit of that kind and see some of the things to which President Jordan referred, and more especially to come and help us there to build sentiment that shall count through the generations to come for world peace. As President Jordan has said, we need you and you need us. What better place than the Golden Gate facing the great Pacific Ocean and fronting the Orient could be selected for the great gathering that shall meet in 1915, for this great body to meet in that great convention city in 1915? You can do us a great amount of good by your presence and I believe we can do you good.

Therefore, again I say, what better place than the great city by the Golden Gate that has risen Phoenix-like from its ashes in a marvelously short time; what better place could there be for beginning a world federation that shall go on and on until the battle flags are furled and the drums beat no longer, for we shall have the parliament of man and the federation of the world? I want to present two invitations, the first from the President of the Exposition and the second from the President of our Chamber of Commerce in San Francisco. This is from President Moore of the Exposition directed to the President of this Congress.

"The Congress of the United States, with the approval of the President has selected San Francisco as the place for celebrating the world's greatest physical achievement, the completion of the Panama Canal in 1915. The nations of the world will assemble not merely representing their most important, valuable and interesting productions, but in a series of congresses which are intended to be the most important the world has ever known. These are intended to bring here the most noted thinkers and publicists of the world, men of all nations, of broadest intellectual grasp of world affairs. We have delegated President David Starr Jordan of Stanford University, Professor Edward H. Krehbiel of Stanford University, and Mr. Robert C. Root of California to appear before your Congress at St. Louis, as the representatives of the President of the Panama-Pacific Universal Exposition, to extend in his name to the members of your Congress an invitation on behalf of the Exposition. We ask for them the courtesy of a hearing and earnestly hope that the sentiment of the Congress will be in favor of holding its 1915 meeting in San Francisco. Should your organization decide to hold its meeting in our city we shall be glad if you so desire to arrange for splendid halls for all sessions."

The San Francisco Chamber of Commerce "extends to the American Peace Congress a cordial invitation to hold its Fifth Congress in San Francisco in 1915. San Francisco in that year will present to the world what we confidently believe will be the most magnificent international exposition ever held

and opportunity will be afforded your Congress to attend this exposition and in addition to transacting the business of the Congress also see the new San Francisco which has arisen from the destruction of 1906 a better and greater city than before and will, we think, prove an incentive to a large attendance at the Congress."

I also have here a letter from the Convention League which I do not deem it necessary to read, but simply inform you that this invitation from the secretary of the Convention League of San Francisco is of like import with those already read. And again in the name of our new city and in the name of the Golden State of the West, in the name of the best and highest interests of humanity, we invite you to join us at San Francisco in 1915 in the greatest Peace Congress ever held in America. (Applause.)

MR. MEAD:

I am sure that this Congress greatly appreciates this generous invitation which has come to it to hold its next meeting in San Francisco. I do not think that any other invitation has come. We appreciate the honor and privilege very highly. In the division of labors in our great peace movement the arrangement for the National Peace Congress is assigned to the American Peace Society. I move you, sir, that, expressing gratitude for this invitation, we refer it with full powers to the Executive Committee of the American Peace Society, which will, of course, decide this matter very early that the friends, wherever this Congress may be held, may be apprised.

SENATOR BURTON:

You have heard the motion that the invitation be referred to the Executive Committee of the American Peace Society. Are there any remarks upon that motion?

[Thereupon the motion was duly seconded and carried.]

SENATOR BURTON:

We will next listen to the report of the Committee on Resolutions.

SECRETARY TRUEBLOOD:

I have had the honor and the very laborious task of being the chairman of the Committee on Resolutions. That is why I am called upon to present to this body the resolutions which we are offering, as a platform and declaration rather than as resolutions. After I finish that there are two or three special resolutions.

PLATFORM OF THE FOURTH AMERICAN PEACE CONGRESS.

1. The Fourth American Peace Congress assembled at St. Louis, May 1 to 3, 1913, and composed of delegates from the numerous Peace Societies, from other organizations interested in the cause, and of representative individuals, from this and other American states, records its sincere satisfaction at the substantial progress which the Movement for World Peace has made since the meeting of the Third Congress at Baltimore two years ago.

2. It particularly expresses its high appreciation of the unique services to the cause of international arbitration rendered by ex-President Taft in negotiating the treaties with Great Britain and France. These treaties constitute the high-water mark of the arbitration movement on its practical side, up to the present time, and the Congress records its deep regret that they were not ratified by the Senate with their full significance preserved.

3. Not less significant, the Congress recognizes, is the noteworthy enlargement and deepening of public sentiment, on the part of nearly all classes throughout the country, in favor of pacific settlement of all international controversies, as evidenced by the immense number of letters and memorials received by the Senators during the discussion of the Arbitration Treaties last year.

4. The Congress rejoices in the failure of the Militia Pay bill to become law, and urges the people of the nation to be on their guard against allowing any such system to be established, as will ultimately fasten on the nation a great and burdensome military establishment, like those of the Old

World, for which our great country has no conceivable need. We call upon all friends of peace to guard against the insidious efforts to extend military training in the schools and to make naval recruiting stations of our colleges and universities.

5. The Congress congratulates the country on the failure, for two years in succession, of the two-battleship program, believing that the nation is so completely protected by its geographical situation, the great strength of its people, and the universal friendship of the other nations, that it does not need to go any further in naval rivalry with the other powers.

6. The Congress respectfully urges upon the President of the United States the initiation, at the earliest practicable date, of negotiations for an international agreement, for not only the arrest of the current naval and military rivalry, but, also, for a simultaneous reduction of armament; that the peoples may be relieved from the heavy and exhausting burdens of taxation, under which they are now suffering.

7. The Congress has learned with much pleasure of the plan which President Wilson and Secretary Bryan have just announced, for securing treaties of unrestricted arbitration with not only Great Britain and France, but also with Germany and the other powers, and for the investigation, by a Commission of Enquiry, of the facts of any dispute which either of the parties may not consider proper for arbitration, before any steps are taken towards hostilities.

8. As it is expected that the Third Hague Conference will assemble in 1915, the Congress respectfully requests the President to appoint, without delay, a committee of not less than five persons, especially fitted by ability and international experience, for the task, to consider what proposals the United States shall present for the program of the Third Hague Conference.

9. It is the judgment of this Congress that the difference which has arisen between the governments of the United States and Great Britain, over the question of Panama tolls, should be disposed of by the prompt repeal by Congress of the provision in the Canal Act, for the exemption of vessels engaged in coastwise trade from the payment of toll. Failing

this, the controversy should be submitted without delay to the Hague Court for arbitration.

10. The Congress makes earnest appeal to the legislature and people of California and to the National Administration at Washington, to secure such just and impartial settlement of the question of alien ownership of land in the State as may not discriminate against the citizens of a great and friendly power, and turn a long standing historic friendship into enmity and friction for the future.

11. The Congress recognizes the vast importance, to the cause of good will and peace between nations and races, of early education in the principles of international justice and morality, the interdependence of peoples and races, and the co-operation of the nations for the promotion of the common good of humanity. It commends the aims and work of the Intercollegiate Peace Association, the American School Peace League, the Association of Cosmopolitan Clubs, and other bodies engaged in this fundamental work, including the various organizations of women, and bespeaks for them more generous sympathy and the larger financial support of which they are in urgent need.

12. The work of federating and affiliating the various peace organizations of the United States into a more unified and co-operative force, which has, since the Baltimore National Peace Congress, been well advanced through the National American Peace Society, has already resulted in increased activity, in the strengthening and enlargement of peace propaganda throughout the nation, and gives promise of much greater efficiency of the Peace Movement in the future. The Congress records its warm appreciation of the Federation of Peace Forces, and expresses the sincere wish that sufficient resources may be found to carry it forward to much greater completeness.

SECRETARY TRUEBLOOD:

That, Mr. Chairman, is the platform as the committee has approved it. You will notice that we have confined ourselves largely to certain important pressing questions. We have not gone on to adopt resolutions on a hundred subjects which we

are interested in. We felt it wiser in this Congress to strike directly at the things which ought to be done for the people of this nation and to decide what could be done without much delay. I submit this as the platform of Congress and move its adoption.

SENATOR BURTON:

What is the pleasure of the Congress?

[Thereupon the motion was duly seconded and carried.]

SECRETARY TRUEBLOOD:

There are two or three special resolutions which are offered as expressing the sympathy and interest of the Congress but not as part of the platform and declaration.

"Resolved, That the schools, churches and other organizations interested in promoting world peace be urged to use as their banner on public days and occasions the national flag bordered with white.

"Resolved, That the President of this Congress satisfy himself of the conformity of this usage to the national provision concerning the flag and be authorized to suggest to the various countries, through their embassies at Washington, the promotion of similar usage in their respective countries; a white border around each nation's flag, being thus a symbol of international fellowship; a bordered flag the emblem at once of the nation and the fraternity of nations."

This is offered for an expression of your judgment.

SENATOR BURTON:

You have heard the resolution. What is your pleasure in regard to it?

[Upon motion duly seconded the resolution was adopted.]

SECRETARY TRUEBLOOD:

Here is another special resolution relating to the opium traffic in China.

THE OPIUM TRAFFIC IN CHINA.

"The Congress rejoices at the remarkable success which has been attained by the Government of China in its century-

long and truly heroic effort to suppress the opium traffic. It likewise expresses the earnest hope that the approaching international Opium Conference, to be held at The Hague, in June, 1913, may consummate the great reform so devotedly desired by China and by all lovers of human progress. The Congress moreover records its grateful appreciation of the part which the United States, through its Department of State, has taken in the international action of the family of nations, looking towards the abolition of the opium traffic; and it further favors such anti-narcotic legislation by the Congress of the United States as shall assist in the stamping out of Interstate Traffic in Opium.

[Thereupon the resolution was upon motion duly seconded and adopted.]

A resolution of thanks to The Business Men's League of St. Louis, to the officials and citizens of St. Louis, and to the press, was adopted by a rising vote.

Hon. Mr. Justice William Renwick Riddell, L. H. D., LL. D., etc., of the Supreme Court of Ontario, Osgoode Hall, Toronto, was next on the program. He had planned to be present, but at the last moment was unavoidably prevented from attending. His paper follows:

One Hundred Years Ago

MR. JUSTICE WILLIAM RENWICK RIDDELL.

In 1879 a well-preserved lady of eighty-one years of age, seated in her beautiful home overlooking the Canadian Thames, wrote to her cousin, a gentleman of high official standing in Ontario, her reminiscences of the war of 1812. She said: "In May of 1814 we had several days of heavy fog. On the morning of the 13th, as the fog lifted, we saw seven or eight ships under the American flag anchored off Ryerse, with a number of small boats floating by the side of each ship. As the fog cleared away they hoisted sail and dropped down three miles below us, opposite Port Dover. Of course, an invasion was anticipated, but no resistance was offered. On

the 14th, the Americans burned the village and mills of Dover ; on the 15th, as my mother and myself were sitting at breakfast, the dogs kept up an unusual barking. I went to the door to discover the cause ; when I looked up I saw the hillside and fields covered with American soldiers. They had marched from Port Dover to Ryerse. Two men stepped from the ranks, selected some large chips and came into the room where we were standing and took some coals from the hearth without speaking a word. My mother knew instinctively what they were going to do. She went out and asked to see the commanding officer. A gentleman rode up to her and said he was the person she asked for. She entreated him to spare her property and said she was a widow with a young family. He answered her civilly and respectfully, and expressed his regret that his orders were to burn, but said that he would spare the house, which he did. . . . Very soon we saw columns of dark smoke arise from every building ; and, of what at early morn had been a prosperous homestead, at noon there remained smouldering ruins. . . . My father had been dead less than two years. Little remained of all his labors excepting the orchard and cultivated fields."

During the lifetime of her husband, the young wife, who had come from New York, had yearned to return to her native land ; "could not relinquish the hope of emerging from the woods and being once more within the sound of the church-going bell," and had been promised by her husband that after she had for six years given "the country a fair trial, if she then disliked it, and wished to return to New York, he would go back with her ; the party feeling by that time would have greatly subsided."

Her daughter continues : "It would not be easy to describe my mother's feelings as she looked at the desolation around her . . . but there was no longer a wish to return to New York."

Captain Samuel White, of the Pennsylvania militia, who took part in this invasion, published an account of his experiences in a 12mo, Baltimore, 1830. He seems to justify the burning, as he claims that the houses burned belonged to

officers who had been engaged in the expedition against Buffalo and Black Rock the year before.

Assuming the good faith of this claim and that it was a valid excuse if true, let us see what the expedition of the previous year was. In December, 1813, a British-Canadian force of about fourteen hundred men crossed the River Niagara at Lewiston, with the avowed object of attacking the American troops at Black Rock and Buffalo, which were assembled, it was thought, "to attempt the prosecution of the atrocious system begun at Fort George of laying waste our peaceful frontier." The orders of Lieutenant-General Drummond were to disperse this force and destroy "the villages of Buffalo and Black Rock in order to deprive the enemy of the cover which these places afford."

This invading army performed its task very thoroughly; the troops were scattered; the houses along the river, and the villages of Buffalo and Black Rock burned. The official report of the British General says: "The town (Buffalo) itself (the inhabitants having previously left it) and the whole of the public stores, containing considerable quantities of clothing, spirits and flour, which I had not the means of conveying away, were set on fire and totally consumed, as was also the village of Black Rock on the evening it was evacuated."

The New York Evening Post of January 11, 1814, said: "This all arises from the wanton and abominable act of Gen. McClure in burning Niagara after he and his militia abandoned Fort George;" and added that the war will "be carried on after this more to satiate the revengeful feelings of commanders and individuals than to obtain any great national benefit from it."

This brings us back to Gen. McClure. He had been in possession of Fort George, Upper Canada, a few weeks before but had deemed it prudent to retire, on the advance of a British-Canadian force; and when he retired, he laid in ashes the unfortified village of Newark, a short distance away. The New York Evening Post of December 29, 1813, said: "The destruction and misery which this dastardly conduct has occasioned is scarcely to be described. Women and children, being

the principal inhabitants, have nowhere to place their heads." Dr. Withrow tells of the wife of Councilor Dickson, lying ill in bed, carried out to the snow in the bed clothes, and lying watching in that bitter December night the destruction of her home with its valuable library. Many tell of vain attempts to save their homes, putting out the flames while the soldiers went around with torches, setting on fire. "Sometimes the fire would be put out by the owners, only to be lit again and again, the owners standing by to see the eventual destruction of all they valued."

These were not all the feats of arms in that war of a century ago. Toronto had been taken in April, 1813, and the public offices burned, including the Court House and Parliament Buildings; the church was robbed of its plate and the library consumed with its records and most of its books. What were saved were kicked around the streets. The evacuation of Toronto took place exactly one hundred years ago, and it was re-taken three months afterwards.

In July, 1814, Admiral Sir Alexander Cochrane issued from Bermuda a proclamation declaring for retaliation, at the request of the Canadian Governor. It read: "Whereas, by letters from His Excellency, Lieutenant-General Sir George Prevost . . . it appears that the American troops in Upper Canada have committed the most wanton and unjustifiable outrages on the unoffending inhabitants by burning their mills and houses and by general devastation; and, whereas, His Excellency has requested that in order to deter the enemy from a repetition of similar outrages I would assist in inflicting measures of retaliation; you are hereby required and directed to destroy and lay waste such towns and districts upon the coast as you will find assailable . . . you will spare merely the lives of the unarmed inhabitants of the United States. For only by carrying this retributory justice into the country of our enemy can we hope to make him sensible of the impolicy, as well as the inhumanity, of the system he has adopted."

And so a British force came up the Patuxent to Benedict and destroyed some tobacco, to Lower Marlborough and

destroyed some more with the building; then to Washington, burned the capitol and the navy yard, destroying \$7,000,000.00 worth of public property and some private property as well.

What a magnificent exhibition of the logic of War!

The American soldier, as he rendered Canadian families homeless in the middle of a Canadian winter, proved conclusively that Britain had no right to impress British seamen on American vessels; the redcoats, when they burned Buffalo, proved that she had; the victorious American kicking along the streets of muddy York the books of the public library advanced an earnest and cogent argument against the orders in Council already repealed, and the flames of the capitol and navy yard seemed unanswerable in the opposite sense.

But notwithstanding these brilliant efforts of ratiocination, the envoys charged with bringing about a peace did not even obtain a decision on any one point in dispute which had been advanced as a cause for war. That most uncommon of all faculties which we English-speaking people call common sense, the English-speaking people claim to possess in the highest degree—I am not sure that they do not sometimes claim a monopoly—and that common sense in both contending nations forced the negotiators to come to terms even although that involved an absolute ignoring of all the alleged causes of the war.

Negotiations were going on in Ghent for months concurrently with operations in the field; neither negotiation nor battle had any effect; it was the common sense, the moral sense of the two peoples, which triumphed. It may perhaps be a matter for congratulation that the latest hostile attacks by either upon the land of the other contestant failed; while the Kentucky Mounted Riflemen were driven from Western Canada, Pakenham suffered defeat at New Orleans.

I have said no word of blood and agony and death; of splendid manhood and courage of thousands and tens of thousands lost to the Continent and the Islands; wounded cripples, living out the rest of their lives in pain and helplessness; the wail and tear of the widow and orphan; or of the dislocation of affairs, national, business, domestic, the pouring out of treasure, the destruction of natural resources. And

with all the valor and self-sacrifice on either side, and all the unutterable barbarity and cruelty of the some on either side, what was settled by this war? Nothing, literally nothing.

There was, indeed, another demonstration of the fact that he whom we call the Anglo-Saxon will sooner fight than eat if he can find a pretext; that when he does fight, he fights with all his might; that he gives himself up to the cause he espouses with his whole heart; that he exhibits a valor unexcelled by any nation, ancient or modern, a devotion and self-sacrifice like those of the Spartan of Thermopylæ, the Theban of Mantinea. Nor has he shaken off the brutality of his progenitors, but is capable of acts of gratuitous, illogical, and senseless inhumanity.

But the whole world knew all that long before, and needed no new lesson. A wicked, wanton war, costly in blood and treasure settled nothing.

Not wholly without effect, however, was it?

Upper Canada was peopled chiefly by those who had left the new Republic; some before, but most after the Treaty of Peace in 1783. These United Empire Loyalists are but now receiving some measure of justice from American writers; their fidelity to principle is hardly yet fully recognized. Within six months, I have been told by an intelligent gentleman in this state (I insist on the intelligence—he was a Judge, and I stand by my Order) that the objection he had to these people was that they were traitors to their country in order to keep their property from being seized, preferring their lands to their land. This of a class of men who sacrificed everything they had from devotion to the Empire and Flag, who refused to barter their fealty for their confiscated lands and . . .

“Got them out into the Wilderness,
The stern old Wilderness;
But then—’twas British Wilderness!”

“They who loved
The cause that had been lost—and kept their faith
To England’s Crown and scorned an alien name,
Passed into exile; leaving all behind
Except their honor. . . .

Not drooping like poor fugitives they came
 In exodus to our Canadian wilds,
 But full of heart and hope, with heads erect
 And fearless eye, victorious in defeat.
 With thousand toils they forced their devious way
 Through the great wilderness of silent woods
 That gloomed o'er lake and stream, till higher rose
 The northern star above the broad domain
 Of half a continent, still theirs to hold,
 Defend and keep forever as their own."

These men, monarchists, were of the same breed as those who were left behind in the United States, republicans; the two factions were alike set upon their respective views of government as were Roundhead and Cavalier a century and more before, and while there were on either side those unworthy of respect—revolutions are necessarily non-moral and we can not expect a revolution either to be advanced or crushed by forces uniformly virtuous and admirable—there is no valid reason for inferring that either side was superior to the other in manhood and integrity. Those who support a beaten cause are always at a disadvantage. Even yet in England, at least aristocratic England, the Roundhead has not come into his own.

With the new Canadian, loyalty was a passion; but he did not cut all acquaintance or refuse to do business with his brother who had been successful in a rebellion against the Crown. The student of Canadian history will find numberless instances of the United Empire Loyalist returning and living for a time with his former friends and relatives, and the American sojourning with his Tory friend in his new home. Moreover hundreds of the rebellious Americans came into Upper Canada to make there their permanent residence, hoping for a fortune, or at least a competence, as within the last few years hundreds of thousands of Americans have come to our Canadian Northwest.

The student of early Upper Canada affairs comes across many instances of the emigrant returning to the home of his nativity to bring away his affianced left behind; and some

maidens who came across the river with Loyalist father returned with Continentalist bridegroom. Some, too, there were who, like Mrs. Ryerse, had hoped "to return in a few years, for party feeling would by that time have greatly subsided." The mere party feeling was not active, the anger, indignation, excited by the refusal of several of the States to implement the implied promises of the fifth article of the Treaty of Peace for reimbursement to the Loyalists for their confiscated estates, had died down; new homes had been made in lieu of the old and there was abundant, if rude, plenty. A feeling of friendship, of kinship, was making its way on both sides of the international line.

Then came the War. I make no enquiry into its origin; recent American historians have done that thoroughly and well. Whatever the origin and ostensible causes, the Canadian saw his country overrun by those whom he had looked upon as brethren, his substance given to the flames, his children slaughtered, all in a quarrel in which he had no part.

As with Mrs. Ryerse, "that was no longer a wish to return to New York;" affection and friendship were replaced by indignation and hate. Loyalty, which was a passion with the first settlers and which has not been bred out in their descendants, came to be identified with hatred of the neighbor who was by birth a kinsman, but who had shown himself an implacable enemy.

Dr. Russell speaks of the anger and indignation over the burning of the navy yard and capitol expressed by Americans he met upon his visit to Washington fifty years after the event. I can speak from personal knowledge of anger and indignation by descendants of those on Canadian soil who had considered themselves injured a hundred years ago. International hatred dies hard, and it is but the other day that school boys in either country ceased (if they have ceased) to sup full of the outrages committed by the soldiers of the other and the glorious, victorious and resplendent valor of those of their own.

Why all this anger, this indignation? War is hell, and always has been. One does not hear the German complain of the ravages of the French forces during the Napoleonic wars, nor does the Frenchman's eyes flash when he thinks of 1871. War is war, and no fault could be found with an enemy for doing his worst. Why, then, did American and British-Canadian feel so keenly and resent so bitterly the usual incidents of war? Was it not the feeling that the two peoples are one? that the division between them is infinitesimal both in point of time and in point of substance when compared with the long history which they have in common, their common ancestry and their fundamental and essential unity in everything which make a people?

It was not because "an enemy hath done this," but because a brother hath done this that the anger was real, the indignation unappeasable.

"And to be wroth with one we love
Doth work like madness in the brain."

And even in their ashes live the wonted fires of past wrongs and discords, ever ready to burst out into renewed flame, destroying confidence and affection brought into existence in the intervening time by acts of kindness and brotherhood.*

*Dr. Dunlop, an Anglo-Canadian army surgeon (afterwards Member of Parliament in Canada) who was attached to the Royal Forces during the war, tells two stories which are worth the consideration of both American and Canadian. "Recollections of the American War, 1812-14, by Dr. Dunlop, Toronto, 1905."

A battle had taken place. Dr. Dunlop says "We had obtained a victory but lost severely in so doing, and the enemy in consequence of the masterly arrangements of Major General Scott, one of the best soldiers in the American army (and one of the most gentlemanly men I have ever met with), had retired on Fort Erie." The narrative then proceeds: "There is hardly on the face of the earth a less enviable situation than that of an Army Surgeon after a battle—worn out and fatigued in body and mind, surrounded by suffering, pain and misery, much of which he knows it is not in his power to heal or even to assuage. While the battle lasts these all pass unnoticed, but they come before the medical man afterwards in all their sorrow, stripped of all the excitement of the 'heady fight.'"

"It would be a useful lesson to cold-blooded politicians who calculate on a war costing so many lives and so many limbs as they would calculate on a horse costing so many pounds—or to the thoughtless

The war came to an end through the efforts of those removed from its sphere of action. I am not wrong in putting it thus: those engaged in the war on both sides desired its continuance.

Now let us contemplate another scene:

On the 22d of September, 1816, two gentlemen arrived from Portland at the small New Brunswick town, St. Andrews.

at home, whom the excitement of a gazette, or the glare of an illumination, more than reconciles to the expense of a war—to witness such a scene, if only for one hour. This simple and obvious truth was suggested to my mind by the exclamation of a poor woman. I had 220 wounded turned in upon me that morning, and among others an American farmer, who had been on the field either as a militia man or a camp follower. He was nearly sixty years of age, but of a most Herculean frame. One ball had shattered his thigh bone, and another lodged in his body, the last obviously mortal. His wife, a respectable elderly looking woman, came over under a flag of truce, and immediately repaired to the hospital where she found her husband lying on a truss of straw, writhing in agony, for his sufferings were dreadful. Such an accumulation of misery seemed to have stunned her, for she ceased wailing, sat down on the ground, and taking her husband's head on her lap, continued long, moaning and sobbing, while the tears flowed fast down her face; she seemed for a considerable time in a state of stupor, till awakened by a groan from her unfortunate husband, she clasped her hands, and looking wildly around, exclaimed, 'O that the King and the President were both here this moment to see the misery their quarrels lead to—they surely would never go to war again without a cause that they could give as a reason to God at the last day, for thus destroying the creatures that he hath made in his own image.' In half an hour the poor fellow ceased to suffer."

Dr. Dunlop speaks in another place of the Glengarry Regiment of Canadian Militia. He tells us, "In this regiment there were a father and three sons, American U. E. Loyalists, all of them crack shots. In a covering party one day the father and one of the sons were sentries on the same point. An American rifleman dropped a man to his left, but in so doing exposed himself, and almost as a matter of course was instantly dropped in his turn by the unerring aim of the father. The enemy were at that moment being driven in, so the old man of course (for it was a ceremony seldom neglected) went up to rifle his victim. On examining his features he discovered that it was his own brother. Under any circumstances this would have horrified most men, but a Yankee has much of the stoic in him, and is seldom deprived of his equanimity. He took possession of his valuables, consisting of an old silver watch and a clasp knife, his rifle and appointments, coolly remarking, that, it 'served him right for fighting for the rebels, when all the rest of his family fought for King George.' It appeared that during the revolutionary war his father and all his sons had taken arms in the King's cause, save this one, who had joined the Americans. They had never met him from that period till the present moment; but such is the virulence of political rancour, that it can overcome all the ties of nature."

One was John Holmes, a resident of what was then part of Massachusetts, but soon to become the State of Maine. He had been a member of the Massachusetts Legislature and was to be a Congressman and a United States Senator, a man of high standing in his community and a true patriot.

The other was Colonel Thomas Barclay, of Nova Scotia, who had recently been British Consul-General at New York, a man of much acuteness and business ability. These two had met at Portland, representing their respective national governments in an enquiry concerning the international boundary. Britain claimed certain islands in Passamaquoddy Bay, as did the United States. During the war the British seized at least one of them and continued to hold it, though before the war it had been granted to landholders by the State of Massachusetts. What better excuse for a war could there be than such a state of affairs? "National honor!" "National territory!" "What we have we hold!" "Not one foot of American soil will ever be given up on any pretext," etc., etc. Do you not hear the Jingo?

But these two gentlemen sat down quietly, and after a number of hearings in St. Andrews and Boston drew the international boundary where it has ever since continued, dividing the islands between the contesting parties, each of the representatives yielding a part of his individual opinion for the sake of harmony and peace.

The United States received the three islands, Frederick, Dudley and Moose, and never even in recent years has there been a word of complaint.

"Peace hath her victories no less renowned than war" and "*Melior tutiorque est certa pax, quam sperata victoria.*"

But you may say the matter in dispute was, after all, unimportant—not worth fighting about. I agree it was not worth fighting about; but there have been many and bloody wars with much less excuse.

Let us, however, take another case. After the United States beat Britain by a head in the race for California, there arose a dispute destined to be of long standing as to the boundary between their territories. Britain claimed down to

the mouth of the Columbia River between 46° and 47° north latitude; the United States, up to $54^{\circ} 40'$. In 1818 an arrangement was entered into that for ten years the strip in dispute should be open to settlers from either nation without prejudice to the claims of either. In 1824 and 1826 attempts were made to determine the international boundary, but in vain; and in 1827 the arrangement was extended indefinitely.

Polk's election was fought and won in 1844 on the party slogan, "Fifty-four forty or fight," and the President in his inaugural address said about as much. England replied in like tone and war was universally expected. But election cries are one thing, legislation another—at least this was so seventy years ago. Arbitration indeed was refused, but two diplomats got together and discussed the situation with candor; and an offer of the Imperial Government to "split the difference" at the 49th parallel was accepted in 1846; the British Government adopting a line which had been offered to them at least twice before. Now here was a strip 400 miles wide, stretching half across the continent, worth untold millions, but the two countries could not get up a war over even that splendid territory.

The trouble was not over: the international line was fixed to run south of Vancouver Island along the middle of the channel which separates the Continent from Vancouver Island. Geography has a way of laughing at diplomats: there turned out to be three channels, each of which might fairly be claimed as the main channel.

It needs no subtlety of intellect to guess how the two peoples made their claims. Rosario, nearest the mainland, was Britain's choice; De Haro, nearest to Vancouver Island, that of the United States, and Douglas, between, was disowned by both. An American commander, General Harney, took possession with an armed force of the Island of San Juan, of which the Hudson Bay Company were in occupation, as British territory. British men-of-war were sent out and—there was no fight. A joint occupation was agreed to, and finally the question in dispute was left to the Emperor of Germany, who decided in favor of the American contention.

And no one complains or feels aggrieved—unless it is the United States.

Almost exactly a hundred years after the beginning of that war, questions of considerable difficulty which had troubled the two nations for many years, came to be decided. This time a Board of Judges was chosen. Two were in fact Judges, an American and a Canadian, and the three others were lawyers of high standing. (I do not use the expression "Jurists of repute;" that has an ominous sound in the ear of a Canadian since 1903.) Their award was hailed with acclaim by all parties. Everyone felt that any settlement of our standing difficulties was better than keeping them alive as a source of irritation, and giving to the "lewd fellows of the baser sort" a pretext for international accusation.

During the intervening century all kinds of questions had been settled by all kinds of arbitrations; questions of boundary; of the amount to be paid for land taken by one government from the subjects of the other; for slaves taken by the warships of Britain from American citizens; where Americans might fish and what the United States should pay for Americans fishing where they had no right to; where Canadians might catch seals and what they should be paid for not being allowed to catch where they had a right to; what Britain should pay for her defective Municipal law, allowing the escape of the Alabama, and many more such questions.

And sometimes there was a single arbitrator, the Sovereign of a friendly state; sometimes two, one representing each party with or without a third to be chosen by lot or otherwise; sometimes five, two by each and a fifth by these four; sometimes five or seven, three to be chosen by foreign princes or potentates named. Sixteen arbitrations during that intervening time with half as many methods of selecting the judges; in all there have been twenty-one such references, all but a mere handful successful.

Not all the awards received the acclaim of that in 1910. Some were considered unjust; one at least was repudiated by both parties; but the discontent was of short duration and died out when the award was submitted. The American,

when he complained of the Halifax award; the Canadian, when he complained of the Alaska award, consoled himself with the consideration, "I have been beaten in a lawsuit; the judges were ignorant or perverse, but at all events my opponent has not burnt my Capitol or slain my son." Patriotism itself—than which, says Pato, nothing is more cruel, and I add, more unjust—could not find a ground for international hate in a lawsuit lost.

This is a utilitarian age; we are all looking for results. Whence are the results worth having? From war, with its present blood and agony, destruction of property and of life, suffering and sorrow, and its legacy of hatred and all evil, or from the determination of all disputes by peaceful means with consequent amity and good will?

Stopford Brooke said: "I am glad before I pass away to see the beginnings of a regeneration of Society. I am glad to believe that it will be wrought not by violence and revenge, but by patient work and ardent faith and hope; and that the stones of its temples will be cemented by forgiveness, their halls built by justice, and their foundations be the brotherhood of man in the Fatherhood of God."

So we in international matters have seen the beginnings of a regeneration working without violence; its halls built with justice.

The determination by the English-speaking peoples that they will conclude their disputes by peaceful means is final and irrevocable, and must in the nature of things have a tremendous influence upon the world at large. For the future of the world in no slight degree depends upon the English-speaking nations; all the others have more than they can attend to at home and can not be expected to take up the White Man's burden. The eye of the world is upon the United States and Great Britain. Where these lead the others will eventually follow.

No one desires or expects a political union, but there is a growing and developing and ever stronger sense of unity which must guide in future actions both peoples.

And is Manhood lost? or anything worth while?

I have elsewhere said: "Discordant notes are to be heard." Of course the "fire-eater" is not dead, or the pessimist, or he who can walk only *per vias antiquas*; while the fool we have always with us. We hear that wars are necessary to keep down population, although the same argument is not advanced for famine . . . that war is needed to awaken and keep alive valor and masculine virtues generally, although those who know most about war know best the absurdity of the argument: there is more valor in one day of attendance upon the sick in an epidemic than in a month of active warfare. I undertake to find ten men to face bullet or bayonet for every one who will face smallpox or malignant fever. We are told that questions of national honor can not be arbitrated, and that if any nation were to fire a shot at a peaceful ship of another, war must ensue, although Britain did not suffer in the eyes of the world or in her own, because she submitted to international arbitration when her peaceful fishermen were shot down on the Dogger Bank; that a man does not go to law when someone assaults his wife, as though that justified him in stealing the other's fish—or as though the circumstance that some outrage might be so gross that law would be forgotten, furnished an argument against law in general.

All these objections will, in the long run fail, and the objectors will—must—suffer defeat. The brute, the tiger, must die, for what is war but a survival of the brute within?

Much better are the words of one now silent, whom that true son of peace, my friend Andrew Carnegie, calls "one of the purest, sweetest white souls that ever breathed."

T'was said: "When roll of drum and battle's roar
Shall cease upon the earth, O, then no more
The deed—the race—of heroes in the land."

But scarce that word was breathed when one small hand
Lifted victorious o'er giant wrong.

That had its victims crushed through ages long;
Some woman set her pale and quivering face
Firm as a rock against a man's disgrace;
A little child suffered in silence lest
His savage pain should wound a mother's breast;

Some quiet scholar flung his gauntlet down
 And risked in Truth's great name, the synod's frown;
 A civic hero, in the calm realm of laws,
 Did that which suddenly drew a world's applause;
 And one to the pest his lithe young body gave
 That he a thousand thousand lives might save.

(Richard Watson Gilder.)

SENATOR BURTON:

Is there any further business to come before the meeting before the illustrated stereopticon lecture by Dr. Tryon? I trust as many of you as can may remain.

One Hundred Years of Peace

ILLUSTRATED STEREOPTICON LECTURE

DR. JAMES L. TRYON

The Hundred Years of Peace, to which reference is so frequently made today, goes back to the signing of the Treaty of Ghent, which in the opinion of Dr. Tryon, marked the end of the last war amongst the English-speaking people. The proposition to celebrate the centenary is said to have come from Senator Root, but it is also credited to Hon. William Lyon Mackenzie King. Committees have already been formed to make plans for the anniversary. At the head of the American Committee is Mr. Carnegie; Earl Grey is chairman of the British Committee, and Sir Edmund Byron Walker of the Canadian Committee. Portraits of the leaders are shown in the lecture and some of the proposals that have been made were illustrated. One of the most popular suggestions that has been made comes from the British Committee. This is to place a memorial to George Washington in Westminster Abbey or in Westminster Hall. In speaking of this proposition, the lecturer showed the Statesmen's Corner in Westminster Abbey and the Poet's Corner in which the bust of Longfellow already appears. Longfellow was said to be the first great man of any country outside the British Empire who was given a memorial in the Abbey. A counterpart of the proposition to erect a

memorial to Washington is one that the American women place a memorial in this country to Queen Victoria.

The lecturer presented pictures of Sulgrave Manor, the home of some of the ancestors of Washington in the time of Henry VIII, which it is now proposed to buy and restore in order that it may be a shrine of pilgrimage and place of call for British and American visitors in the future. In connection with his visit to the manor, Dr. Tryon told the legend that is current there that the origin of the stars and stripes of the American flag was the shield of the Washington family, though the fact is disputed by some historical authorities.

Stratford-on-Avon was paid a brief visit to show the truth of Lowell's observation that our two peoples are bound together by a bond of common literary association. Slides were shown of the American window in Shakespeare's church, the John Harvard House, and the Child's memorial fountain at Stratford. The last picture taken of James Russell Lowell in his study at Cambridge was shown in connection with the Child's memorial fountain. Washington Irving's service as the first peacemaker between the United States and Great Britain after the war of 1812 was explained by the story of the Sketch Book and Bracebridge Hall. Pictures of the Red Horse Hotel and the room in which Irving stayed while visiting Shakespeare's town were shown. The influence of Sir Walter Scott on the reading public of this country was emphasized by a quotation from John Hay, and pictures of Scott and Loch Katrine.

The lecturer also visited Ghent and explained that part of the celebration would take place there, as the Burgomaster of that city has proposed to give a banquet to British and American guests on occasion of the one hundredth anniversary of the banquet given by the municipal authorities of that city to the British-American peace commissioners. Dr. Tryon also said that plans were being made to extend the scope of the celebration in order that it might appeal not only to citizens of the United States and Great Britain, but to all the nations who would be invited officially to participate in it. He himself favored having international processions like the Burritt pro-

cession in all the large cosmopolitan centers of population. Every nation might then show by symbolic floats and tableaux what it had contributed in the past hundred years to the sciences and arts of peace. By means of such international processions it could be shown that every nationality had done its part toward the progress of civilization.

In the latter part of his lecture, Dr. Tryon illustrated dramatic incidents in the relations between the United States and Great Britain which show that some of the most serious kinds of disputes that ever occur between nations may be settled either by diplomacy or arbitration; among these incidents are the Northeastern Boundary Question, which was adjusted by Webster and Ashburton; the Trent Affair, in which the influence of Prince Albert for Great Britain and Secretary Seward for the United States was used to meet a crisis that brought the two nations to the verge of war; and the Alabama Case, the most famous international law suit in history, some of the leading characters in which were Hamilton Fish, Mr. Gladstone, and Charles Francis Adams. These incidents were illustrated by portraits of the men who had distinguished part in them, and by scenes which their deeds made famous.

The lecturer closed with a discussion of the controversy that has arisen between the British and American governments over the question of the Panama tolls. Portraits of Lord Pauncefote and John Hay who made the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty, and of the men who are now engaged on either side in presenting the claims of the respective countries were given. "I believe," said the lecturer, "that this question will follow the course of all others that have arisen between our two peoples in the last hundred years. It will be settled either by diplomacy or arbitration. There is a rising tide of indignation all over the country at the thought of the violation of a treaty and a growing feeling that the treasury of the United States ought to receive the benefit of the tolls, and not a monopoly that is already highly protected by having exclusive rights to American coastwise shipping."

INTERNATIONAL PEACE THROUGH INTERNATIONAL LAW

Saturday Afternoon, May 3, at 2 o'clock

SHELDON MEMORIAL LIBRARY

E. C. ELIOT, Presiding

The principal address at the section on "International Peace Through International Law" was delivered by Professor Roland G. Usher, of Washington University. The subject was "The International Law of Airships." The address, in part, follows:

International Law of Airships

PROFESSOR ROLAND G. USHER.

The recent incidents along the French frontier have called attention in unmistakable fashion to the airship as a possible cause of international difficulties, and the treatment accorded the officers and men of the German airships by the French authorities will probably somewhat influence the formation of a set of rules governing aircraft which will in time secure general approval. Most conspicuous of all the aspects of the problem of the air are those differences from the problems of sea and of land which render inapplicable the majority of the rules and precedents of international law as it is at present understood. First of all, it is evident that the famous doctrine of *Mare Liberum* will not apply; the air will not be neutral international "ground," free to all aircraft without question or regulation. The statute law of various countries has already recognized the common property of all citizens in the air above the zone which can be effectively utilized for buildings and has also conclusively declared the liability of airmen for any damage caused by themselves or their machines. But there can be no doubt whatever that

these doctrines will not be extended to international aircraft. The difficulties are obvious.

In the first place, even the simplest case of damages raises the question of proof. Was the "accident" unavoidable? Was the damage intentional? The well-known and acknowledged untrustworthiness of aircraft, their liability to simple accidents, complete loss of control by the airmen under many contingencies make the plea of culpability *prima facie* improbable. Even in the really important international question of the "accidental" landing of foreign aircraft near enough the defenses to make it probable that the occupants obtained knowledge of vital importance, this issue of intent is paramount and is so difficult of solution that it seems almost impossible to obtain any evidence of innocence or guilt. In the nature of things, the "accidents" were so simple and happened under such circumstances that no witnesses were or usually will be available to show conclusively that there was enough fog or cloud or wind at the altitude which that particular craft had attained to make it impossible to follow a given course or that the aeroplane which landed in French territory because of a lack of petrol was not intentionally so disabled by starting with an insufficient supply or by opening the cock of the petrol tank after the flight had begun. The probability of loss of control for any of a hundred reasons is too generally admitted; the impossibility of the proof of malfeasance is too obvious to enable any rule to be based upon either the assumption of guilt or of complete innocence.

All of these facts were evidently in the minds of the French authorities when they elected to treat the recent incidents as of no consequence. Certain general propositions are, however, clear. Evidently they considered the air above France French "territory" and the Germans trespassers. Evidently, too, they recognized openly that aircraft are not completely in the control of their crews and are liable to accident, under such circumstances that the investigation of the "accident" is impossible. Something more than the assumption of hostile intent, than the possibility of obtaining valuable data about fortifications will be demanded before any

risk of international complications will be incurred. It is also beyond doubt that the impossibility of obtaining evidence of intention or of accidents has caused a very widespread feeling among statesmen, military officers and publicists, that such incidents must not happen at all. From the recent comment, it seems probable that a demarcation of air-frontiers will take place in the near future quite different from the land frontiers. The air will not be divided by a perpendicular erected on the land frontier nor will there be a belt, as at sea, of a certain number of miles between the neutral ocean and the shore. There will be a series of zones, whose breadth will be regulated by the distance objects can be distinguished or effectively photographed from aircraft in flight and which will be definitely assumed to be hostile ground. The presence of any aircraft on or over this zone will be *prima facie* evidence of hostile intent and will be treated accordingly. On either side of the frontier will therefore be a hostile zone, say thirty miles broad (air photography is effective up to twenty-three miles), and outside these somewhat broader zones which will be entered by aircraft only in case of accident, and whose breadth will be regulated by the distance a high wind would carry a disabled craft before a safe landing could be probably effected. These zones will, of course, effectually prevent aircraft from landing in foreign territory on account of the loss of ordinary control, the exhaustion of gasoline, gusts of wind, and the like. Evidently, the air just over the boundary line is not to be neutral territory, except for the purposes of defense and offense. Evidently the air, unlike the sea, is not to be neutral "ground," open to the common use of all nations and individuals. As in a recent English instance, private individuals will be allowed to cross the frontiers only after due notice of the date, hour, direction of the flight, and place of landing have been previously communicated to the authorities.

THE MILITARIST CHALLENGE

Saturday Afternoon, May 3, 1913

SHELDON MEMORIAL AUDITORIUM

DR. BENJAMIN F. TRUEBLOOD, Presiding

CHAIRMAN TRUEBLOOD:

The topic of the afternoon is "The Militarist Challenge," whatever that may mean. I suppose the framers of this program had in mind the men who say that war has always been in the world and that war will always be in the world, and therefore we must provide for war; that you can't trust human society or the interests of commerce without preparation for war and fighting. Some people say that the only way to have peace is to have such an army that no nation will dare attack us, and that this is going to bring about peace on earth. The theory of the peace party is that that method has been tried time and time again, and every time it has failed. I am not arguing this question at all. I am only telling you their challenge.

I have the honor of introducing as the first speaker of the evening Dr. William P. Rogers, Dean of the Cincinnati Law School, who will talk about "Militarism and the Average Citizen."

Militarism and the Average Citizen

DR. WILLIAM P. ROGERS.

We are living in an age of extravagant hoarding and spending of money. The science of extracting from others and amassing for ourselves seems not only to have obsessed the individual but to have taken a deep hold upon the states and the nation.

It may be that the passion for collecting has back of it the pleasure or power given in the distribution of large amounts, or that our necessities, whether imaginary or real, demand such depredations.

Certain it is that in no previous time of peace have so many forms of law been enacted for the sole purpose of bringing revenue into the numerous funds of government.

There is a tax upon the farm and on the mortgage given to secure payment of the money with which it is purchased. The tangible property of a corporation is taxed; then its stock; also its franchises; likewise its income and finally the shareholders themselves are required to pay, not on the face value but the actual value of their stock. There is an inheritance tax and soon we shall have an income tax. The ramifications of the tariff tax still make this great problem an unsolved puzzle.

If there is any form of taxation which is not somewhere being imposed upon the average citizen, the omission is unintentional. But when our average citizen has paid all these direct and indirect taxes, imposed by the government and other institutions, he finds little, if anything, left representing his efforts at the end of the year. Do not blame him if he is driven to meditation. Do not censure him if after serious reflection he demands a reason for the plucking he has undergone. Do not be alarmed if in the absence of a satisfactory explanation he, with other average citizens, undertakes in a limited way to correct what appears to be an unchecked evil. Let us not console ourselves either by concluding that such evils are imaginary or that if they do exist they are not of sufficient importance to cause apprehension of danger to either our government or to the great mass of our people. An examination of some of the facts bearing upon the subject is at least worth while.

One of the great political parties of this country representing more than six million voters has in its platforms for a number of years been attracting the people's attention to this subject. True it was the note of the party outside looking in, but its ring seems to have met a favorable response from those in whom lie the power of fixing and transferring the government's control.

In 1908 that party in its platform stated that the "Congress in the session just ended made appropriations amount-

ing to \$1,008,000,000, exceeding the total expenditures of the past fiscal year by \$90,000,000, and leaving a deficit of more than \$60,000,000 for the fiscal year just ended." "We denounce," they say, "the needless waste of the people's money, which has resulted in the appalling increase, as a shameful violation of all prudent considerations of government and as no less than a crime against the millions of working men and women, from whose earnings the great proportion of these colossal sums must be extorted through excessive tariff exactions and other indirect methods. We demand that a stop be put to this frightful extravagance, and insist upon the strictest economy in every department compatible with frugal and efficient administration."

In 1912, it said "We denounce the profligate waste of the money wrung from the people by oppressive taxation through the lavish appropriations of recent Congresses, which have kept taxes high and reduced the purchasing power of the people's toil. We demand a return to that simplicity and economy which befits a democratic government and a reduction in the number of useless offices, the salaries of which drain the substance of the people."

It is interesting in this connection to note the amounts which have been appropriated by the Congresses for the past few years. They are as follows:

Forty-third (1875-1876).....	\$ 653,794,991.21
Forty-fourth (1877-1878).....	595,597,832.28
Forty-fifth (1879-1880).....	704,527,405.98
Forty-sixth (1881-1882).....	727,537,684.22
Forty-seventh (1883-1884).....	777,435,948.54
Forty-eighth (1885-1886).....	655,269,402.33
Forty-ninth (1887-1888).....	746,342,495.51
Fiftieth (1889-1890).....	794,146,424.98
Fifty-first (1891-1892).....	1,023,792,365.35
Fifty-second (1893-1894).....	943,617,052.28
Fifty-third (1895-1896).....	917,013,523.34
Fifty-fourth (1897-1898).....	954,496,055.13
Fifty-fifth (1899-1900).....	1,553,349,675.60
Fifty-sixth (1901-1902).....	1,476,886,291.61

Fifty-seventh (1903-1904).....	\$1,533,212,267.55
Fifty-eighth (1905-1906).....	1,497,751,475.90
Fifty-ninth (1907-1908).....	1,789,404,176.47
Sixtieth (1909-1910).....	2,014,758,228.54
Sixty-first (1911-1912).....	2,054,584,510.90

The American citizen is patriotic. He delights in his country's development, in her prosperity and even in her expenditure of money in promoting her welfare and the well-being and happiness of her people. He realizes that "The public welfare is the supreme law," and does not begrudge one dollar appropriated for this purpose. But by investigating the purpose of these enormous expenditures he is by no means convinced that they are largely for the public welfare. On the other hand he is quite sure that much of this money contributed unconsciously by our toiling millions is being used to our country's detriment and to the degradation, rather than to the uplift of her moral standards.

Recent events in the world's political history reveal the fact that the average man, the common citizen, has not only awakened but that he has become active in affairs of government.

The most careless observer of current events must necessarily be deeply impressed with the recent political revolutions which have occurred within our midst. We have seen a party which has been in power almost continually for more than half a century, not only ruthlessly overthrown, but its ranks so decimated, and its leaders so divided that it has been transferred from its lofty place of prestige and leadership—not to second, but to third place as a political organization.

Instead of an enthusiastic united membership of seven million voters, it emerges from the conflict with less than one-half that number of discouraged adherents, all of whom seem to ask, not whether we shall again come into power in the near future, but whether we shall be able to revitalize our scattered ranks and so far recover from the stinging defeat as to hold our present membership and again grow into the nation's confidence. It required no great wisdom or foresight on the part of any one, prior to the recent election, to fore-

tell the results. The people were outspoken in their dissatisfaction, and set in their determination to express their sentiments so far as this could be done by the ballot. They were not sure of the exact cause of their condition, but they were quite certain that they were living in the shadow of some monstrous evil which was casting a blight over them. They believed, whether justly or not, that this evil had been permitted to develop, even if it had not been nurtured by the party in charge of government, and they proposed to protest so far as they were able by their votes to do so, against existing wrongs. They had observed the harvest of the most bountiful crops the earth had ever produced, resulting in the unaccountable contradiction of the highest cost of living they had ever experienced in times of peace or war. If there was an abundance, which under the ordinary law of supply and demand would reduce the cost to the consumer, the people saw the markets cornered, the necessities of life bought at a smaller price from the producer, placed in warehouses and in cold storage and withheld from the consumer till he should yield to the demand for famine prices.

With the country prosperous and a demand for all kinds of labor at good wages, the working man, the artisan, the clerk, salaried and professional men of all classes, found that expenses continually enlarged; that even with the bare necessities of life, the ledger at the end of the year disclosed a discouraging deficit, which tended as nothing else could do, to dishearten the worker. For in material things there is nothing which so inspires one as to find that he is accumulating; to know that the end of each year finds him somewhat more prosperous than before. Such results make his labors seem worth while, and stimulate him toward greater progress. They make of him also a better citizen if he can in any manner trace his prosperity to the government and the laws under which he lives. And the truth is that this vast army of voters have learned that the laws and government have so much to do with their prosperity and their adversity that they have determined, whether wisely or not, to enter more actively into the formation of both. And when the citizen began cast-

ing about for the reasons and the causes which check the progress of the man underneath, he found himself in a net so entangled, in a maze so intricately woven about him, that instead of attempting to gradually thread his way out, as he might have determined to do, he felt impelled to suddenly break the bond with which he was fettered. These voters learned that while the population of the United States was about one hundred million of people, and the aggregate wealth about one hundred and thirty-two billion dollars, that three-quarters of this wealth is owned by about ten thousand of these people.

It is a fact that of the necessary things required in the common man's household a dollar now has a purchasing value of not more than sixty cents of the value of a dollar twelve or fourteen years ago. It is estimated that the average income of the heads of some sixteen million families in the United States is between six and seven hundred dollars. These families constitute very largely the people of our nation. When these meager incomes are compared with what seems the wasteful extravagance of our nation's expenditures for military purposes, it is not surprising that our citizens are protesting with their ballots.

Does anyone believe that our average citizens, this vast number whose annual income is so small that want is ever knocking at their doors, would, if given an opportunity to express an opinion on the subject, favor the expenditure annually of two hundred and eighty-two million dollars on our army and navy in time of absolute peace? Are these citizens, who in reality are the governing force of our nations, when they choose to be, in favor of the policy of multiplying our dreadnaughts at a cost to themselves of fifteen million dollars for each great battleship till we surpass Germany and England in our monstrous war equipments?

Will they agree with the recent public expression of a member of the Navy General Board, that we must build battleships so rapidly that within the next six or seven years we shall have forty-eight dreadnaughts, when there is on our horizon not the slightest indication that our friends (and all

the nations of the world are friendly toward us) expect to attack us or that we will attack them? The average citizen can not and should not be kept in ignorance of these extravagant expenditures. He should know that the firing of a single shot from a 13-inch gun costs his government more than double his annual income and that the proposed naval diversion of sinking the *Indiana* by making of her a target to be shot to pieces by other battleships will represent a loss in money, counting the battleship at what it cost the government, of more than his aggregate income for ten thousand years. He should know that to build one of the proposed dreadnaughts will cost his government more than the aggregate annual incomes of himself and twenty thousand other workmen, and that to build forty-eight battleships such as the last one proposed to be built by the United States will cost more than the aggregate income of one million of our average citizens.

The voters of this nation, who are or should be the final arbiters of all the momentous questions which vitally affect the nation's welfare, should know, if they do not already understand, that our annual naval and military budget equals, if it does not surpass, the aggregate annual income of four hundred thousand of these citizens.

The U. S. Treasurer's report for 1910 shows an expenditure for the army of \$158,173,000; for the navy, \$123,974,000; total, \$282,147,000.

Recently the whole nation has been astounded and moved with sympathy on account of the enormous loss of life and property caused by storm and flood in a number of the states. Thousands of homes were destroyed and only desolation marks the places where formerly they stood. Notwithstanding the extensive ruin of homes and property, public and private, the amount which our government expends for the building of only a few battleships would amply restore all this property loss. To everyone who reflects for a moment will occur many additional illustrations indicating the numerous ways and methods by which these vast sums of money put into the construction and maintenance of battleships might be utilized to alleviate human misery and advance the progress of civiliza-

tion. When the citizen asks what we propose to do with all this costly armament when completed, he is told that it is to be used in protecting our shores against an attack by some nation which has a larger navy, such as England, Germany, France or Japan. The citizen of either of these nations to the same question would receive a similar answer relating to other nations. Each nation knows positively that it entertains no thought of using its battleships for anything but defense. If this be so, there can be no attack, and therefore no defense against a stronger nation's attack.

Government must of course be sustained and it must be supported by voluntary or involuntary contributions from its citizens. For within itself there is no source of revenue. As an entity it is not the proprietor of vast wealth or vested endowments. But for what should it be sustained? Is the purpose of government to establish peace or foment dissensions? Is it to build up, to develop all that is best within its province or to tear down and destroy. "Must sovereignty forever prove and declare itself in government by slaughter," or may not international relations also be brought under government by education and the gradual unfolding of the principles of Christianity?

Every thoughtful man and woman who has given any consideration to the subject knows that the sentiment of world-wide brotherhood has grown and developed in that proportion in which the nations have come into touch with each other. They realize that within the last half century the development of this feeling of common humanity throughout the whole world, has more than equaled that of all the prior centuries combined. This can be accounted for in innumerable ways, not the least of which is the universal advance of civilization, refinement and culture. Civility can not exist except in the recognition of the rights of others. And always when these are regarded on either side, hostility is terminated or prevented. It is also a fact, undisputed, that during the same period wars and international conflicts have been reduced in the same proportion that the sentiment of human brotherhood has developed. No one who can hope for respectful

attention will declare that the world is not better today than it was five hundred years, one hundred years, or fifty years ago. The trend of humanity is necessarily upward. This upward elevating tendency necessarily means the recognition of the rights of others, growth in culture and refinement. And this all means, just as absolutely, that the great danger of all that which stands for the reverse of these things becomes more and more remote. It means that society is being continually reclaimed from savage life and customs, the most savage of which is the carnage of war.

And yet our actions contradict our logic and give the lie to every profession of faith we make in righteousness. They put to shame the doctrine of human brotherhood and make all our open declarations of love for, and confidence in humanity as the merest shams, uttered in the spirit of diplomatic finesse and chicanery. Our words are soft and gentle, expressing a wish to uplift and help humanity, but the battleships we are building are implements of destruction, pointed at our neighbors, ready at any moment to ruin and annihilate, not simply our brother man, but all the good that man has accomplished. Not only ready to mangle humanity but to shoot confidence into fragments, to lay waste the foundations of truth, and to leave desolate the advances of civilization.

The nations of the world stand today with a frown of defiance, but lisping the words of peace. They have "entwined the branch of olive around the bolt of Jove, ready to hurl the latter, under the deceitful cover of the former."

But here as elsewhere the average citizen is being deceived. By bitter experience he has learned that wars based, as they so often have been, on the petty disputes of narrow-minded rulers, mean annihilation to the common man. He is coming to realize how impotent is the nation's declaration of war except for his participation. He has observed that the fuel for war is the average citizen and that its flames when once enkindled only vanish and cease after these common men, these average citizens have been consumed. And when for this reason the conflict ceases, those who were responsible for the declaration of war and the resulting havoc but who

themselves have escaped unscathed, because they kept aloof from its flames so often tardily conclude that some simple error, some slight misunderstanding, some difference which might with reason have been adjusted, was the cause of it all.

It is estimated that during the nineteenth century, fourteen million of such men perished in the wars of the world.

Formerly, men and nations seem to have esteemed the warrior's occupation the most honorable, the most commendable of all human endeavors. War and conflict were regarded as man's normal condition. So successful were these efforts toward exterminating the human race conducted, that an estimate of fifteen billion lives sacrificed in wars since the beginning of authentic history is commonly accepted as approximately correct. This statement can better be comprehended, and appears more striking when we are told that the number of common men and women thus slain equals the number of all the people who have lived on earth during the last six hundred years.

Are not these results sufficiently startling to justify men of today who read and think and vote and act for themselves as men of former ages could not do, in refusing to sacrifice their lives in battle except as a last resort, and until all other methods of settling justifiable quarrels have been exhausted?

It is stated that the present total annual military expenditures of the world approximate \$2,250,000,000, and that this enormous amount is still to be increased. Now when our average citizens fully realize that the greater portion of this toll is taken from their earnings either directly or indirectly, and is expended largely in military equipment which is to be used in the extermination of their fellow men (and do not forget that this is the purpose of military equipment), will they not be justified in calling a halt upon those nations which have gone mad in their efforts to surpass each other in these unnecessary burdens?

We are informed by the daily press, that at this very hour while we are here assembled to consider methods looking toward the advancement of universal peace, many of the leading statesmen of the world's most enlightened and most powerful nations are inventing plans and formulating systems by

which greater military burdens are to be imposed upon their people. The efforts of Germany to raise at once by direct taxation a special army fund of \$250,000,000, which requires of France action of a similar kind are common illustrations of our present-day military burdens upon the people. Corresponding with this added military tax is the proposed increase in men who are to be taken from their business and professions where they are producers, and as soldiers, added to that vast number whose business it is not to produce, but to destroy. The present peace forces of Germany are increased from 658,000 men to 765,000 men. Those of France from 546,000 men to 750,000 men.

The following table taken from a Paris paper shows more fully the military activity of these nations:

	Men on Active Service	Reserve	Totals	Reserve or Landwehr (1st Levy)	Total of Forces Mobilizable
ARMIES					
Since the laws of June 14, 1912....	658,000	742,000	1,400,000	1,358,000	2,758,000
GERMAN					
After the newly pro- posed law.....	765,000	1,145,000	1,910,000	1,720,000	3,630,000
At present.....	546,000	590,000	1,136,000	1,475,000	2,611,000
FRENCH					
After the law of 3 years' service....	750,000	590,000	1,340,000	1,475,000	2,815,000

These European people have by long experience learned to be patient and uncomplaining when weighed down by taxation for military purposes. But the burden has almost reached the point of breaking down and crushing out the people's life. A cry like this is occasionally heard through their press:

"A tax of this sort is only imposed in times of the gravest need, when it is necessary to act quickly because an enemy is at the gate." "The invocation of such extreme measures in time of peace will easily create the impression that they are the last sheet anchors of an impoverished country." "The

proposed colossal expenditure of \$250,000,000 is a symptom of the present international drunkenness over armaments."

Or from another German source a statement as follows: "It is 'a policy of folly,' and we do not pretend to see the end of it." "We are on the eve of a new period which will involve enormous sacrifices, financial, material and personal, and will deepen the antagonism which exists between the capitalist states. It is a policy of catastrophe; militarism is becoming a menace more and more violent to the state. Middle-class society shows itself insatiable, and militarism, the instrument of its creation, is becoming a tyrant of this society; not a single party of the middle classes dares any longer to resist this militarism; all are incapable of checking the ruinous career of this despot."

And from a Paris paper this comment is significant: "The weakest point in the present situation is the financial question..... We admit that our war budgets should be increased annually to a figure necessary for the increase of our military effectives. But, unfortunately, since 1902 and more particularly since 1906, and even to a more aggravated degree under the present legislature, the country has been given over to the most reckless extravagance. This extravagance is not merely the result of neglect or carelessness, it is partly systematic, for the benefit of those who would reap the pecuniary advantage."

And so everywhere the cry is heard against extravagance and the burden of taxation, especially in military affairs.

In Europe, in America, wherever civilization has advanced, the common man is coming forward, demanding recognition in matters which affect his interests. And when the common men of the nations of the world resolve that there shall be a check put upon the useless extravagance of arming ourselves to the utmost limit of our resources against each other, the rulers will obey the peoples' will or retire from their exalted positions. May we not hope that this universal awakening of the average citizen to his power and to his rights is an indication that in the future he will demand that every other expedient for the settlement of international disputes shall be exhausted, before his body shall be offered as a sacrifice on

the altar of his country? Let him insist upon his nation doing that which his nation requires him to do, when disputes and difficulties arise, namely, settle all such matters by reason, in courts of justice, and not by force.

We are gradually but rapidly coming to see that communities, states and nations are, after all, only aggregates of individuals, not only with the human weakness and human passions possessed by individuals, but also with the wisdom to recognize this weakness, to check and curb these passions and to reason together as individuals do in their affairs. And herein lies the world's hope for war's final extermination. We are establishing world courts, to hear and try the causes of nations, by rules of law, rather than by the regulations of warfare; courts where these disputes are not practically settled in advance in favor of the nation having the largest navy or the most powerful army, but seats of justice, where the unarmed nation like the peaceful citizen may in confidence submit his cause, to be heard and determined on its merits. What sane man, or what righteous nation can object to such a plan? And with such a court established, why shall a whole nation be thrown into a panic, and stand in fear of an armed conflict when some slight difference arises between nations? Let us entertain and display faith in the nations who are our neighbors just as we do toward the individuals who are neighbors to us, and we shall have no greater occasion to arm ourselves as nations, than we have to arm ourselves as individuals.

CHAIRMAN TRUEBLOOD:

Our next speaker is Professor Ernst Richard, president of the German-American Peace Society of New York, who will address us on "How Can We Show Our Good Faith in the Peace Movement?"

How Can We Show Our Good Faith in the Peace Movement

PROFESSOR ERNST RICHARD.

Sincerity is the great demand of our days. Yes, it is perhaps the greatest, the most urgent need of our time in our daily civil and social life. For what else is at the root of

graft and corruption, of dishonesty in trade relations and other unhealthy social and political conditions than that lack of veracity, that endeavor to make things and deeds and persons appear different from what they actually are, which, if it concerns the expression of our own feelings and opinions, we call insincerity. There certainly is need of a greater sincerity in all spheres of life. It might therefore seem to be rather out of place to claim it for one particular phase of human interest as it is presented by the peace movement.

But there is more than the fact that it happens to be this one phase which stands in the center of our interests today that seems to make it important to emphasize the value of sincerity to us, the advocates of peace.

Insincerity has become so common in our forms of social intercourse that we are tempted to contend that it is not expected of the average individual, yea, there are even those who say that absolute sincerity would make a smooth and amicable life impossible. People do not feel the wrong of their insincerity so strongly perhaps because they think it has become conventional. They feel as if sincerity was no part of their duty any longer. In a certain sense and to a certain degree nowadays two persons may be insincere in their expressions and relations to each other while either knows that the other is insincere and still more, either is aware that the other possesses this knowledge of their insincerity and still they continue in the same hypocritical way. This state of affairs is illustrated by the story of the two Yankees that met in a train. They were competitors in business and the one asked the other: "Say, Hiram, whither are you going?" "I am going to Boston," said Hiram. "Well, now," said Zebediah, "Hiram, you tell me you are going to Boston because you think when you say Boston I shall believe you will go to New York, but now you are really going to Boston. Why do you lie to me like this?"

However, since in this case insincerity has spoiled its own purpose, that is to mislead the other, it may on the surface appear not as dangerous as it is immoral. But this habit has become so general that we hardly can keep ourselves free from it and are apt to fall in line without being conscious of

it. It is true this refers only to the average work-a-day life as it rolls on mechanically without calling for much moral or other reflection. However, as soon as we take it upon us to stand up for human progress or something outside of the common, when we try to show to mankind our higher ideal that is removed from the general valuation of dollars and cents, something man wants to turn to when he desires to rise above himself, then everybody expects first of all that we believe ourselves in what we say and that we act up to it. Deeper than any fraud that makes us lose material wealth we feel deceit in the ideals to which we look up. The pain will last longer and, although for this kind of fraud no penalty is set by law, we feel the criminal who cheats us out of money to be infinitely less hateful than the false prophet who makes sport of the best in our soul. And are not the advocates of peace holding up one of the highest ideals, a most precious hope before the longing of the human soul?

And what is the great obstruction to the realization of universal peace? What else but mutual distrust? How then can we expect to remove this obstruction, how to make the nations confide in one another when we do not deserve confidence ourselves? Indeed, more than others the nation that calls herself peaceful must be sincere in this assertion, must be ready to verify it by action if she wants to gain confidence. She must do more. She must give proof that she is ready to trust in her sister nations herself.

You see that I do not intend to accuse any of our individual collaborators of insincerity nor do I take it upon me today to warn against too great a readiness to misjudge those who are not willing to go as far as the most radical representatives of the peace movement or who differ as to the best method of bringing about the desired end. If anywhere, we must practice in an ideal movement like ours that fairness which concedes complete liberty of thought. In advocating sincerity it is our whole nation of which I think and it is the question what can we as a nation do to make the other nations believe in our readiness to give and accept justice in our international relations to which I try to find some reply. We are perhaps more than any other nation

called upon to give proof of our sincerity in the advocacy of international peace. We consider it as our mission in the world to teach the nations the great lessons of liberty and peace. We claim that the great majority of our people are in favor of peace. If this be true, then our democratic institutions certainly should give expression to this will of the majority. Moreover, we are so situated by nature, with no neighbors of equal strength near us, that we are almost immune to foreign attack, unless we provoke it ourselves; more than that, our economical position in raw materials produced in this country makes our friendship extremely valuable to the most powerful nations, and indeed it would take unusual provocation to bring forth hostile action against us. It certainly would not be generous to use this exceptional position to unjust advantage.

But does the spirit of peacefulness and good will assert itself sufficiently in this country? It is true that we have done a great deal towards the promotion of the peace idea amongst the governments but is it not rather much to expect of the world to believe in the sincerity of our assertion, if we look at the fate of those famous arbitration treaties which are lying unsigned through our fault at the State Department of Washington. It is we who have issued the invitation to conclude these treaties of arbitration, and what have we done when the nations have come forward to grasp the hands which we had so boastfully offered? We have withdrawn them, and it is a sign of the unwillingness of the other nations to hurt our feelings that we are not held up to general scorn and ridicule. Here then is perhaps the first step to be taken in order to make good our pledges. The great law of social relations, be it between individuals, be it between nations, is to give up part of our own rights, in exchange for duties towards us. If the senators will forego their unsound jealousy of their privileges they will exchange for them the greater stability of our foreign relations.

Of course one of the most important points is that our people learn to respect the sacredness of international treaties. We must not allow that sophistical doctrine to retain power that a pledge of our nation is not as valid as a pledge of any single member of our nation. In urging this point I do not

even refer practically to any actual attempt to obey treaty obligations in which we may be engaged at present. Nor do I say that we are more guilty in this respect than other nations. On the contrary here is the sore spot of international politics all over. The history of diplomacy is a record of broken treaties. The governments still seem to be bound to the Machiavelian doctrines of the period of absolutism. In their foreign politics they feel not responsible to the people and they consider them as a game of the cabinets. In other countries the political conditions offer, not an excuse, but an explanation for this state of affairs. The nation as a whole does not consider itself responsible for the policy of its government. But we can not escape this responsibility. It is therefore our duty not to leave the field of international politics to the Secretary of State and the Committee of Foreign Affairs of the United States Senate, but to see for ourselves that the interests of the whole nation and not those of a special group only, are safeguarded and that our national honor is upheld. But upholding the national honor does not mean only protection against any possible insult by irresponsible foreign individuals, but above all and in the first place it means to uphold our national honor by avoiding any action on our own part that may not only blot it, more than any attack from the outside will do, but that will fundamentally destroy it by forfeiting our claim as a nation to honesty, veracity and sincerity. We certainly will not defend our honor when we resent being called dishonest after we have broken solemn pledges.

But in this question of international relations, we work under special difficulties not encountered by other nations. Even when our national government makes an honest endeavor to stand by our treaty obligations it is frequently met by interference on the part of states desirous to please their imaginary sectional interests above those of the nation. One of the principle purposes of our national government is to protect us against international disturbances and still our states refuse to yield to the common good what is demanded in fairness and justice. There are other states—unions who are much more jealous of their sovereignty and much less homogeneous than we are, but these states possess political maturity enough not

to endanger the peace of the nation for particular interests and not to use their sovereignty to promote a breaking of the peace. The question is not a simple one to decide. It requires serious study, but there is no doubt that if there is good will, a satisfactory solution can be found and must be found if we want our relations with foreign nations to be governed by justice and by the principles of international law.

Another difficulty is the change of policy so often involved in the change of party power in our government. The incoming administration might promptly repudiate the promises of their predecessors. That I am not theorizing but refer to actual occurrences which must prevent our enjoying the firm confidence of others in dealing with us, we all know well enough. Here is a most important point where the activity of the peace societies must set in to help toward a change by a serious study of the political principles involved, education of public opinion and by agitation for healthier conditions. We surely can not expect our protestations of peacefulness to be considered sincere if we are not willing to offer justice under the same conditions as other nations.

There still remains in us some of that old barbarous spirit that sees an enemy in every stranger. We never can be sincere in our peace assertions as long as any trace of it is left. Here is a field for our school education. Our children must not be instructed in the history of their own country alone, but must learn to respect other nations by being informed how they have worked out their national destiny, and have at the same time contributed to the common civilization of humanity. They must learn that their views and mode of life are entitled to consideration, and by this become not only better citizens of the world, but also of their own nation. The spirit that looks down upon the foreigner is the spirit that is willing to do injustice, the spirit that is ready for violence if the power is present. Must I tell you that this spirit of contempt for anything foreign is strong amongst us? I will remind you of the patriotic citizen who shot down an Italian flag a year ago which was hoisted to do homage to our national holiday. If you want to see how readily we are led into injus-

tice you simply scan our laws. Not so very long ago the legislature of the State of New York passed the law which excludes aliens from inheritance. This then is the amount of our sincerity: we preach the brotherhood of man, we say you are my brother—but when it comes to the sharing of worldly goods, one may be born even from the same mother and father, he is not our brother, and shall have no part in his parents' inheritance, unless he is an American citizen. It would be well worth the while of the friends of international peace and justice to examine our statutes systematically for similar legislation and in the interest of justice, honesty and self respect agitate for their change at least on a basis of reciprocity.

The longer I think on this subject of sincerity, my friends, the less I am satisfied with our activity in this movement. I am honestly convinced and I am sure all will agree with me, that we Americans should make good our claim to be the first in this peace movement as we are the oldest in it. I feel sorry every time I see a great international agreement or convention concluded for the good and progress of humanity in which our nation has no part and there are many of which we are no party. There are nations described as warlike that far surpass us in this respect, that spend a much greater amount out of their public funds for international institutions and purposes than we do. But what can be more conducive of international solidarity than common work of all nations for the common good of all mankind. There is really more unity in some lines promoting civilization, in legislation secured by treaty, between nations of Europe which are commonly believed to wait for the first opportunity to wage war on one another, than there is between the United States of our Union. The federation of the world, the international administration which has been developed to a much greater extent than most people are aware of, is the real aim of the peace movement of which international justice is only a part—how can we show our sincerity better than by promoting every act, every institution, every enterprise that makes for it. Let me remind you in this connection that one of the institutions to be supported by all nations that are for peace is the International Peace Bureau in Berne. Our

government is as yet not one of those contributing to its support, and there are many other institutions just as important.

Indeed as I have tried to show a large field is open before us if we do not content ourselves with making speeches and passing resolutions that are not followed up by deeds. But let me now turn to some proposals which have been brought to your attention anew, proposals which refer in a narrow sense to our object of reducing the possibilities of war and are quite independent of the other nations. We can proceed and prove that we mean what we say when we pronounce ourselves leaders in the cause of peace. They are well defined legislative acts for which we should take up a vigorous and persistent agitation. The first is the proposition to amend our constitution in such a manner as to forbid Congress to declare war unless an effort of peaceful settlement has been made and rejected. In this respect the constitution of Brazil sets an example. Article 88 of this Constitution says: "In no case, either directly or indirectly, alone or in alliance with another nation, shall the United States of Brazil be engaged in a war of conquest," while Article 48 gives the President of the Republic the right to declare war at once in case of foreign invasion or aggression. We find, however, that Article 34 says: "The National Congress shall have exclusive power to authorize the Government to declare war if there be no opportunity for arbitration, or in case of failure of this, and to make peace." The Constitution of Brazil at once shows the good faith of a nation in its assertions of peacefulness. The very presence of this provision in the constitution is surely, in part, responsible for the fact that at no time it has been necessary to appeal to it. We want the United States of America to take the lead in this question of the peaceful settlement of international disputes, in extending the empire of law, and in strengthening the appreciation of international justice. Could this be done in a more efficient way and shown in a plainer manner than by inserting a similar provision into our own constitution?

Another proposal seems to me not quite as simple as the other, but it is the one that appears to be favored by practical statesmen, politicians and financiers. It calls for legislation

forbidding the solicitation of loans in this country by nations engaged in warfare. I will refrain from discussing the point at length because it has received more public attention than the other. Two former members of the Cabinet, Messrs. Strauss and Root, have publicly declared in favor of it and so has our present Secretary of State, William Jennings Bryan, in the most eloquent manner six years ago before the National Peace Congress in New York City. A bill of that character has been promised for some time. All those interested in our cause ought to see that our representatives and Congress will enact legislation which will certainly demonstrate that American citizens are willing to forego the chance of financial gain if by doing so they can serve a higher purpose.

It is not by declaiming and passing resolutions against war, not by following the old ruts of timid defense that we serve our cause best, but by making concrete, constructive, progressive proposals. They must and will gain ground. We can not insist on the limitation or decrease of armaments if we do not create conditions which make them superfluous. We must give evidence to the world that we believe that a firm resolution of a nation to do justice and to meet solemn obligations is a stronger guarantee of peace than dreadnaughts and cannon. We must inaugurate the era of international confidence, of sincerely trying to deserve the confidence by deeds of our own. To propose a way to this is the purpose of the foregoing propositions. I do not doubt there are many other ways by which we can and in some instances must prove our sincerity in the cause of peace—a splendid opportunity for activity in an ideal cause, and even if there are some differences of opinion between the peace workers on a few points how much work is there to be done on the usefulness of which we all agree, in which we all can unite in order to further the great and wonderful cause to which we all are pledged.

None of the proposals with which my remarks were concerned need be replaced by or have any bearing at all on the admirable proposition recently submitted to the world by Secretary Bryan. I think all Americans, and especially we peace

advocates, must rejoice and be proud that one of our fellow citizens has had the courage to take this decisive, uncompromising and reasonable step forward.

CHAIRMAN TRUEBLOOD:

Our next speaker is a lady. There are a good many women in the peace movement, and I have been a little bit surprised that they have not been given a more prominent place on the program of this Congress. Our next speaker is performing very important service in this country. She has founded two prizes, of two hundred dollars and one hundred dollars, for the best essays to be written by the young women in young women's colleges of America, these prizes going on year after year, at any rate for the present. That is a very useful service. Then she has made possible, by the giving of considerable money to extend, and she proposes to continue as the Lord wills, the organization of the Church Peace League of this country, growing out of the Federated Council of the Churches of Christ in America. This League proposes to have in it as nearly as possible every Christian church in this country, and to bring in tens of thousands of men and women in these church organizations into this peace movement. I have great pleasure in introducing Mrs. Elmer Black, who will address us on "Democracy and Peace."

Democracy and Peace

MRS. ELMER BLACK.

Just now, when we are celebrating the centenary of the Treaty of Ghent, it is very pertinent to note that fifty years before that time Immanuel Kant in his little book "Eternal Peace" enunciated a great and fundamental truth, to the effect that when all nations became democracies war would cease, since it was governments that made wars—not the people.

The English-speaking nations are more nearly democracies than any other. War between them is unthinkable because among the people themselves the spirit of peace prevails. The day is long since past when a constitutional government can wage an unpopular war—unpopular with its own people, and

the stronger the voice of the people in any government so much the stronger will be the influence for peace. I recall that only comparatively recently when the German government began to talk war with France over the Moroccan Embroglio, 100,000 German workingmen, the democracy, marched to a public square and protested that they had no quarrel with their fellow workingmen in France. That peace thought in 100,000 minds, definitely and concretely expressed for peace, was more powerful than the government.

Five years before that, at the great conference of the Social Democracy of Europe, at Stuttgart, the German and French workingmen put themselves on record as being unwilling to bear arms against each other, except in self-defense. Again, here is the example of the truth of Kant's belief, however his statement may seem at times to be qualified in isolated instances.

When the proposition to add two hundred and fifty million dollars a year to the military budget of Germany was announced, the protest came from demonstrations of the people. Democracy always moves toward brotherhood, and brotherhood always oversteps boundaries. A nation that is truly democratic moves away from exclusiveness toward universal relationships. Governments pursue isolated ends; the people find that their ends are the same that all other peoples are pursuing—justice, comfort, well-being, happy lives.

"As a man thinketh in his heart, so is he" may today be expanded, broadened and beautified, to comprehend even the greater truth that as a nation thinketh among its people, so is it. If it appears at the present moment that a great and wonderful people of the East are thinking war against the United States, it is well to remember at the same time that selfish interests that might desire such are industriously working to sow the war thought in the minds of the people, thereby again recognizing this fundamental truth that it lies with the democracy to make for peace or for war. And, in this same instance, it is worthy of note that one of Japan's great statesmen, the Count Okuma, has enunciated to his followers another great and fundamental truth to the effect that it is the Christian thought that will prevent war.

Kant was right: The hope of peace lies in democracy. The people will put an end to wars. This being true, the whole aim of the peace movement should be to link the movement to democracy. The failure to do this has been its weakness in the past. The reason the Hague Conferences have accomplished so little is that its members are delegates of governments and do not represent the people, and governments are not so vitally interested in peace. What progress has been made toward peace in Europe has come largely from demonstrations of democracy. It is not from senates we shall get peace, but from the people. The first duty of us all, therefore, is to democratize the peace movement.

How can this be done? The first thing is to recognize the fact that we should have been working on for years and have neglected most of all. It is the simplest fact of psychology, namely, that all actions spring out of the "thought-habit" of the people. People who are thinking war will rush to war when the crisis comes. People who are thinking arbitration will turn to it instinctively when the dispute arises. Our impulses spring out of our minds. Our spontaneous deeds flow from our constant thought.

But the thought habit of the people is determined by what is forever before their mind and eyes. A German peace worker recently said that the difficulty in teaching peace in Germany was that the boy saw nothing but soldiers, read nothing but militarism in the papers, heard nothing but war in conversation. The result was that to him war would be the first impulse when a quarrel came.

At present, war and preparation for war is forever and everywhere before the people's eyes. While war rages, the columns of the press are clamant with the fury of the fighting and the exploits of the troops. No sooner have the cannon ceased sounding than we are regaled with fresh alarms and accounts of how the Powers are heaping armaments on armaments in a new race for supremacy. It is the talk of the exchange and the workshop. So long as this persists there is little hope for any rapid progress in the peace movement. Our congresses and dinners, even our Hague Conferences,

will hardly make a ripple on this great stream of militarism pouring like a flood through the minds of the people.

The only hope of the peace movement is to pour as great a flood of peace and arbitration through the minds of the people as the flood of war talk proceeding from those who want war. We have got to get the arbitration idea before the people more impressively than strife makers get the war idea before them. The army and navy men, with the manufacturers who make money out of blood, are popularizing war by keeping the press full of it.

If the German armament makers can pay even French papers to stir the people of Germany and France to go to war, in order that human lives may be turned into dollars, surely we peace people should make an effort through the press to stir the people up to good will, for love of humanity.

We are now spending perhaps a million dollars annually in all the world for peace, if we include the incomes of the big endowments. Somehow we are not getting adequate results. The press has columns on militarism—peace appears in paragraphs. The one time when arbitrations figured more conspicuously in the press than war was when Mr. Taft toured the country for arbitration, and when the churches and peace organizations petitioned Congress. The peace movement received from this the greatest impulse it has known, because the people, reading peace, thought peace. In the spending of this million dollars just now, would it not be well to turn aside from the academic channels into which we are putting so much of it, and put it where it would make the people think in terms of justice instead of battleships, law instead of war.

We should have two pages of arbitration in the papers to counteract every page of militarism. We should have the best writers in the country applying the antidote to the poison of those who are now hired by the militarists and manufacturers of war material.

Our pulpits should resound with peace sermons. Our histories in our schools should give prominence to peaceful achievements rather than to deeds of war.

There should be more lectures before our women's clubs, patriotic societies, and boys' clubs, on the heroes of peace, for the great heroes are those who save human life, not those who take it.

Great peace pageants should be held quite as often as naval parades. There should be more peace congresses and greater effort should be applied to getting them widely reported.

Thousands of dollars should be put into prizes for essays in schools and colleges, and these prizes should be so attractive that almost every student in America would write and think peace for months.

Every preacher's study and every editor's office should be flooded with peace literature, real literature—books they would read.

This brings me to my last word. We have just organized the Church Peace League for this very purpose. The League was suggested at a luncheon which I gave two years ago to the delegates of the British and German Peace Leagues, then visiting America. The Peace Commission of the Federal Council of the Churches took the task in hand, and as a result we have launched the Church Peace League, with the Rt. Rev. David H. Greer, D. D., Bishop of New York, as president, and Rev. Frederick Lynch, D. D., as secretary. We already have many of the most distinguished clergymen of the nation on our list.

Our purpose, as expressed in our Constitution, is: "To enlist the churches of America in the movement to substitute judicial methods for war in the settlement of international disputes, by establishing a permanent world court of justice; to foster good-will and the spirit of justice among the nations; to hasten the realization of the brotherhood of man, and to seek that world unity which shall bring peace on earth."

The League proposes to further this object by the following methods:

1. By enlisting all ministers and religious workers and securing their more active participation in the growing movement for international peace.

2. By securing frequent sermons in all the churches on international peace and by inducing their various organizations connected with the churches to place this subject upon their annual programs.

3. By preparing lessons and exercises to be used in the Sunday schools and young people's organizations.

4. By securing the presentation of the great themes of international peace and world unity before the regular meetings of the churches, national and local, and before the various associations and groups of clergymen.

5. By the co-operation of the religious press and the preparation of various articles and books on the peace movement, calculated to be of especial value to ministers and churchmen.

6. By the fullest possible co-operation with the similar leagues of Great Britain and Germany, in holding frequent conferences with the officers of these leagues, and by an exchange of British and German preachers with America.

But back of it all, the one great purpose we have in mind is to democratize the peace movement. We are going to keep arbitration before the eyes of the people so much that soon they will think in terms of law instead of war, justice instead of force, gospel instead of guns.

CHAIRMAN TRUEBLOOD:

This Congress is fortunate in having in attendance seven of the ministers of the Latin-American republics south of us. They have come appointed as delegates to the Congress by their governments, for our Peace Congress in the years to come will have not only delegates from the United States, but all over the world.

I take great pleasure in introducing one who will bring us "Greetings from Mexico," Señor Alonso Mariscal y Pina.

Greetings from Mexico

SEÑOR ALONSO MARISCAL Y PINA.

I have the honor of giving and do give you a most hearty salutation in the name of my country and testify that it has

always been the spirit of the Mexicans to be aware of all that is good and just in the United States to improve it. If history couples us into harmony, it is because the present life of the Mexican people so much resemble in their highest personifications the best kind of American men in the view of those who have seriously studied the parallel political life of both nations.

No attention is paid, of course, to the vulgar and unhistorical criterion which in a critical moment marks as eternal moral feature of a nation the bloody misdeeds of the days of war.

It is glorious for any man to come here and witness for himself that, precisely, this great American nation which has been so abundantly rewarded in her love for liberty, is the very one in the modern times so earnestly interested in finding positive solutions for the disturbances of peace all over the world. It is also satisfactory for human feeling to see that many great Americans who are conspicuous in almost all channels of human evolution are the great patronizers of these illustrious gatherings. It is also a most beautiful vision to grasp that here any voice, no matter how humble it is, may have resonance among you all who, I hope, will in this opportunity afford if not all at least several practical formulas of peace.

Every nation has days of gloom and days of sparkling light. I come from one which unfortunately is confronting the bitterness of those gloomy days. I have to state for Mexico and for myself, as I did the day before yesterday at the City Club, and must now repeat that we are not only advocates but thirsty seekers of peace. Light from you and advice are hopefully contemplated by all those whose humanitarian wishes in these moments depend upon you.

Therefore, my praying is that consideration should be imparted to the "whereas" and "resolutions" of this Fourth American Peace Congress through an analytical classification of topics.

It is essential that the Congress define the extent of peace herein advocated. That extent is to my mind a five-fold one.

First, the peace between strong; second, between weak; third, between the strong and the weak; fourth, the civil peace, and fifth, the international peace.

I think that if we duly contrive for the pacification of men, we must encompass all our mental energies upon each and all these sorts of peace, that every "whereas" scattered from here should be as it ought to be, a ray of logical light, and every resolution should be as well a practical formula properly suitable for the healing of war in a determined case, as a medicated recipe fits a thorough diagnosis. A thorough pragmatism doctrine is intensely wanted by many nations and demanded from these great assemblages of science and administration; a doctrine I mean that in the field of facts will confront these problems.

Is it a nonsensical whim, as that of the tobacconist and the alcoholic, to relinquish dear children and home to rush into the battlefield to kill and be killed?

Is it or is it not a historical solution to the problem that no evolution, no institution of justice and therefore of liberty has ever been grounded except upon bloody contests?

Concretely, could in the field of facts the independence and the unity of the United States of America be acquired without war, without Washington the savior, and Lincoln, the redeemer?

If so, what is the logical science that is to be substituted for the historical fact? What shall the wise give to a war troubled nation? a blame? an advice?

Architecture and medical sciences embody sanctions never to be long expected. The sins against equilibrium and physiology are immediately punished by the crashing of the walls or in the convulsions of deadly intoxication. But unfortunately it does not so happen with the sins against justice, unavoidably punished with agonies, those long agonies we call war.

Do we speak of peace? Then ipso facto we have at hand questions of justice, problems of law, categories of jurisprudence. Consequently it is to be expected that this Congress has a lasting moral personality. The future will avail itself of the valuable work of this Fourth Congress in order

that the problems which will necessarily occupy other illustrious minds of following American Congresses of Peace shall be thoroughly solved according to the rules of concrete international or civil law.

In a last consequence those studies and practical solutions made to face all emergencies for all cases and nations ought to have the utmost publicity and be transmitted to the succeeding congress as truly starting points for more and more achieved deliberations.

Would that it be so, and that in a few years from now the law of nations could find in the conclusions of these congresses new light for logic and new provisions for the administration of justice, of justice which, by the inexorable law of nature, is the only and almighty peacemaker.

SCIENCE AND INTERNATIONAL PEACE

Saturday Afternoon, May 3, at 2 o'clock

ODEON RECITAL HALL

PROFESSOR WILLIAM I. HULL, SWARTHMORE COLLEGE, Presiding

CHAIRMAN HULL:

One of the most significant and encouraging facts in regard to the peace movement of our time is that men of scientific training and achievements have been devoting more and more to its promotion the efforts of their scientific researches. In this way it seems to me that the peace movement is being placed upon a very sure foundation. President Jordan told us this morning that out in California you sometimes find two people who agree but never find three people who agree. I have been told of a Missouri saying very much in the same effect: A quarrel is a bad thing because it may lead to guns and death; but a difference of opinion is a very good thing because it leads to horse races and apologies. I thought perhaps it might add interest to the scientific discussion we are to have this afternoon to read a statement from a German general which I have no doubt will bring out a difference of opinion. This general says that the love of peace so zealously fostered by many noble souls is a voicing of a delusion which should be called positively immoral and be branded as unworthy of the human race. War is not only a necessary element in the life of peoples and also a desirable feature in civilization but the highest expression of force and life of fully civilized peoples. When the land is taxed by an increasing people and land for colonization can not be won from uncultivated races, for the surplus population which its own land can no longer feed and which must be kept for the State, nothing else remains but to acquire the necessary territory by means of war. The instinct of self-preservation impels them to war and to the conquest of alien lands. Then right

is no longer with the possessor but with him who comes out conqueror in battle.

I venture that the peoples who are thus referred to as the possessors of that land which is to be thus conquered would have something to say as to that proposition. The first speaker this afternoon will perhaps act the part of their spokesman for he is to speak I observe upon the topic, "Ethnic Factors in International Relations." I have great pleasure in presenting to you to speak upon this subject Prof. Maurice Parmelee of the University of Missouri.

Ethnic Factors in International Relations

PROFESSOR MAURICE PARMELEE

There are many factors which influence international relations. Among the most important are language, culture, religion and commerce. If the peoples of two countries speak the same language intercourse between them is much easier and sympathetic relations are likely to exist between them. If two nations are of about the same culture with respect to the development of science and art, the diffusion of knowledge, moral standards, etc., this culture is likely to serve as a bond of union. But if the cultural differences are great they may give rise to a feeling of antipathy, or, to say the least, the one nation is almost certain to look down upon the other nation as being of a lower grade of culture. If two nations are of the same religion this may serve as a bond of union. But if they are of different religions this difference may give rise to hostility, especially if one or both of these religions are of a militant sort. If two nations have commercial relations which are to the mutual benefit of both they are almost certain to remain on friendly terms with each other. But if they are rivals in commerce such rivalry is very likely to lead to hostility and sometimes to war.

In this paper we are to discuss the part played by ethnic factors in international relations. That is to say, we shall try to ascertain to what extent and how ethnic differences between the peoples of nations affect the relations of those

nations towards each other. These differences are with respect to external anatomical characteristics such as stature, facial features, the color of the skin, the character of the hair, etc., and with respect to the internal organs such as the brain, and the nervous system in general, the heart, lungs, etc., all of which play a part in determining the psychic characteristics of a people. It is, however, very difficult to segregate these factors and to study their effects because they are inextricably mingled with the other factors which have been mentioned. This is true, in the first place, because these ethnic characteristics have their influence in part indirectly through the other factors. That is to say, the language, culture, religion, etc., of a people are determined in varying degrees by these ethnic characteristics. But it is very difficult to determine in any specific case to what extent this is true as compared to the influence of physical environment and such chance circumstances as relations to other peoples.

But it is also difficult to determine how ethnic differences influence international relations directly. These differences frequently give rise to feelings of antipathy, as when the color of the skin or the facial features of one ethnic stock are regarded as ugly if not repulsive by another, or when the odor of the skin of one ethnic type is unpleasant to another. But it is evident that in some if not all of these cases esthetic and sometimes moral and religious ideas as well are involved so that these antipathies are due in part and perhaps sometimes entirely to cultural differences. It would therefore be difficult to say in case of any one of these antipathies whether it would exist on the basis of the ethnic difference alone if the cultural differences were lacking. All the difficulties mentioned will be illustrated in concrete instances in the course of this paper.

It is now evident that this paper must consist largely of a study of the degree and permanence of ethnic differences. Since our interest is largely with respect to the future the discussion may take the form of an attempt to answer two questions. The first is as to whether ethnic differences are sufficiently great to keep the contrasted ethnic stocks permanently in different cultural statuses. The second is as to

whether these differences are sufficiently great to prevent a final amalgamation of all the ethnic stocks. In a word it is a question of the possibility and probability of cultural and ethnic uniformity in the future.

There have been many theories as to the part played by ethnic characteristics in determining the culture of a people. At one extreme we find such a writer as Gobineau, who in his treatise on the inequality of the human races tried to prove that there is a great deal of difference between the ethnic stocks as to their capacity for culture. At the other extreme is Boas, who insists that there is practically no difference between the ethnic types in their capacity for culture. It is evident that many of the physical differences between the ethnic types do not imply mental differences. For example, color is in the truest sense only skin deep, and is a racial adaptation to climate. Stature, the shape of the nose, etc., do not in themselves involve specific mental characteristics. But great differences in the brain and the rest of the nervous system, and in certain other of the viscera, would necessarily involve important mental differences and therefore variation in the capacity for culture. Such differences would be in the instinctive, intellectual and emotional make-up of the representatives of the type. Let us see how probable it is that there are such great differences.

There is a certain amount of variation in the size of the brain between the different ethnic types, but it is not at all certain that this variation is sufficiently great to cause any material difference in mental characteristics. This is indicated by the fact that as great variation is to be found in the brains of the members of the most civilized peoples and even among the ablest representatives of these peoples. In the structure of the brain and of its cells, also, there is probably no great variation, though such variations would be of even greater significance than variations in size. In similar fashion, in the rest of the nervous system there is probably no great variation between the ethnic types. When, however, we come to some of the other viscera, such as the heart and the lungs, controlling the circulatory and respiratory processes, the variations are probably somewhat greater as the necessary result of

adaptation to climatic conditions. It is unfortunate that we do not have a larger amount of data, and more accurate data, as to the ethnic differences. But what we do know seems to indicate that in the fundamental instinctive characteristics there can be no great differences between the ethnic types. In similar fashion it is doubtful if there can be very much variation in the intellectual capacity of these types. But in the emotional make-up there may be considerable variation, because, according to the prevalent psychological theory as to the nature of emotions, the emotions are determined in large part by the processes of the internal viscera such as the heart and lungs, and we have seen that there may be considerable variation in these viscera between the different ethnic types.

Let us now survey briefly the peoples of today with respect to this relation between ethnic characteristics and culture. If we take the primitive peoples the first and most important things to be noted is that these peoples represent all the ethnic types. If there was a close correlation between ethnic characteristics and culture it would be expected that these primitive peoples would belong to one or only certain ethnic types, while the civilized peoples would belong to other types. Furthermore, studies which have been made of certain primitive peoples seem to indicate no great differences in mental characteristics from civilized people. For example, the Cambridge University Anthropological Expedition, which studied some of the most primitive peoples in the world in Australia and Melanesia, found no great differences in the senses and the mental processes of these savages. Doctor Myers, the psychologist of the expedition, came to the conclusion that so far as innate mental capacity is concerned these savages are of about the same grade as European peasants. These facts seem to indicate that the low culture of these primitive peoples is to be attributed principally to environment and to such circumstances as contact with other social groups.

Turning now to the civilized peoples, we find a similar heterogeneity of ethnic type. For example, in Europe we find such heterogeneity in every nation. And yet it is popularly supposed that the culture of each people is due largely to

peculiar ethnic characteristics. Thus we hear the culture of the French nation attributed to the "Gallic Race," the culture of Germany attributed to the "Teutonic Race," etc. But the researches of the ethnologists have revealed the fact that in France, for example, are represented all the principal European ethnic types. Thus in the north of France the Nordic race is predominant, in the central part the Alpine race is predominant, while in the southern part is to be found in large numbers the Mediterranean race. Thus it is evident how difficult it would be to trace the peculiar features of French culture to peculiar ethnic characteristics. In similar fashion in Germany the Nordic race is most prevalent in the north, while the Alpine race becomes predominant in the south. Such movements as the Pan-Germanic movement and the Pan-Slavic movement are frequently regarded as having a peculiar ethnic significance, but, for example, in the countries which constitute Pan-Slavism, namely Russia and certain of the Balkan countries, all of the European ethnic types are represented, and also a considerable intermixture of Asiatic blood. The Jews present a similar example of this error. Most of the Jews themselves as well as most non-Jews, regard the Jewish people as a distinct ethnical type. But ethnological research has shown that there is a great deal of variation between the Jews in different countries, so that it is evident that through intermixture the Jews have lost ethnic unity. The peculiar features of their culture are due to their history and social status rather than to these ethnic characteristics. So far as such movements as Pan-Germanism, Pan-Slavism, Zionism, etc., try to preserve characteristic cultures, they may be of great value. But when they give currency to mistaken ideas of ethnic unity they may do a great deal of harm.

Such mistaken ideas of racial identity have frequently furnished the basis for a national self-consciousness which has led to an assumption of superiority over and hostility towards other races. A realization of the fact that cultural status of a people is frequently due mainly to its environment and circumstances rather than to its ethnic characteristics would ameliorate these hostile relations. Furthermore, these facts

suggest the possibility of a uniformity of culture the world over, which possibility we shall discuss later in this paper.

Let us now consider the second question proposed, namely, with regard to the possibility of a final racial amalgamation. This is, of course, largely a question of the feasibility of crossing between the principal ethnic types. There are three of these types, namely, the white or Caucasian, the yellow or Mongolian, and the black or Negro. We have already discussed how antipathies may arise between ethnic types. We have seen how these antipathies may arise from cultural differences such as different esthetic ideas. Thus where antipathy is based upon difference in skin color or facial features it is largely, but not entirely, an esthetic matter. Where an antipathy is based upon such a thing as difference in odor it may seem to be innate in its origin and therefore permanent. But even such an antipathy may be partly or largely the result of a difference of taste and therefore due to cultural differences. In fact, it is very difficult to determine whether any antipathy is innate and therefore an insuperable barrier between races. If there is no such innate antipathy, with uniformity of culture all antipathies should disappear. Such a final racial amalgamation would then seem to be possible. However, there may be other obstacles in the way, and in any case it is not necessarily advisable to work for such an end, which question I will discuss a little later.

Let us now consider what have been and are the actual relations between these ethnic types. The whites and the yellows have already mingled to a large extent, so that a considerable proportion of the population of Asia is a cross between the white and yellow races. They have also mixed to a slight extent in Europe. These facts seem to indicate that there is no very serious antipathy between these two types. It is true that at present there is a good deal of hostility between these two races, but this is undoubtedly due in large part to cultural differences and political difficulties.

In his relation to the black, the white has shown a good deal more antipathy. The reasons for this are very evident, since the differences between the white and the black are much more striking in appearance and much more obvious.

And yet even between the white and the black there has been a good deal of mixture. In Northern Africa the two races have been mixing for thousands of years, and even in Europe we find traces of a slight amount of mixture in the past. In America we find curious differences in the extent to which the white and the black has mixed. In North America the Anglo-Saxon has to a large extent stood proudly aloof from the black, though he has frequently condescended to illegitimate relations with women of color. But in the southern part of North America, in Central and South America, the Portuguese and Spaniards have mixed very largely with the blacks and have displayed very little of the usual antipathy. These facts suggest that this antipathy of the white to the black may not be as fundamental as it appears, and is due to esthetic ideas and cultural differences and also perhaps to the consciousness of the fact that the blacks until very recently were uncivilized and then slaves.

Between the yellows and the blacks also there has been some display of antipathy, though it may not be as great as between the whites and the blacks. I have said nothing about the American aboriginal type. In Latin-America this type has been assimilated very largely by the white, while in Anglo-Saxon America it has become almost extinct.

These facts seem to indicate that these racial antipathies are not as innate or as permanent as they seem to be. But this does not mean that there are no other obstacles in the way of racial amalgamation. Each of the ethnic types evolved in a more or less characteristic physical environment, and is therefore adapted to such an environment. Thus the negro is adapted to his color, physiological processes, and temperament, which is due largely to emotional characteristics, to a tropical climate. In similar fashion the white is adapted to a temperate climate. Now it may be that neither of these types can become permanently adapted to another climate. The evidence as to this is as yet inconclusive and rather conflicting. But even if such adaptation could finally take place it may hardly be worth while to attempt it, since the process of readjustment would be rather painful. So that for these

climatic reasons it may be preferable for the principal ethnic types to remain distinct.

If these types do remain distinct, the very important question arises as to whether they can persist side by side on an equality with each other, or whether some will necessarily remain permanently subject to others. This will probably depend in part upon the relative prolificness of these races. That is to say, the more prolific races will in the long run have the advantage so far as numbers are concerned, but it will also depend in part upon the possibility of a uniform world-wide culture. That is to say, if a race proves incapable of attaining to as high a culture as other races, however prolific it may be, it may still remain subject to another race because of the advantage that a higher culture gives that other race. It is believed by many that this may prove to be the case for the negro race. However, we have seen that there is probably no great difference in intellectual capacity between the different ethnic types. There may, however, be a good deal of difference in emotional characteristics, which play an important part in determining temperament, so that if the negro or any other race remains subject permanently to another race it will probably be due to such emotional characteristics.

We have now discussed very briefly some of the facts and probabilities as to the part played by ethnic factors in international relations. We must now consider what practical deductions may be drawn as to international relations in the future, especially with respect to war. In the first place, a dissemination of knowledge as to the theory of evolution and of the ethnic relations between peoples ought to have much effect in lessening racial prejudice, removing many international antipathies, and promoting international comity. If it were generally known that all the ethnic types have a common ancestry, and that many nations are similar in their ethnic make-up, it should have a good deal of effect towards accomplishing these ends. For example, to take a concrete illustration, if it was generally known that northern France is more like northern Germany ethnically than it is to southern France, and that southern Germany is more like central

France ethnically than it is to northern Germany, this knowledge ought to have a good deal of influence in promoting international good feeling between France and Germany.

In the second place, it will probably on the whole and in the long run be well to develop as fast as possible a world-wide cultural uniformity. I am well aware of the objections that some have to this. They fear that such a dissemination of culture will deprive the whites of their power of many subject races, and may in course of time even give these races the ascendancy over the whites. It is true that such uniformity of culture will quite probably lead to the emancipation of these subject races, but this will, in all probability be to the benefit of these races and may also prove to be to the benefit of the whites as well. Furthermore, it is hard to believe that such uniformity of culture should ever lead to the subjection of the whites, because the very fact of uniformity would imply equality between the races of the world.

When we turn to the question of a final racial amalgamation, it is hard indeed to draw any practical deductions. There is a great deal of difference of opinion as to the advisability of miscegenation or the crossing of races. It is of course to a considerable extent a question of whether the races being crossed are equal in capacity or whether the one is superior to the other. If they are equal it would appear as if there should be no loss as a result of the crossing and if anything a gain. If the one is superior to the other it may lose as a result of the crossing, but on the other hand the inferior one ought to gain, so that the loss ought not to be greater than the gain. However, we have seen that it is hard to determine whether any race is materially superior or inferior to the other races biologically and psychologically, so that it may be that the races should be regarded as being practically on an equality for purposes of crossing. But regardless of the question as to whether the races being crossed are equal or not there is the further consideration as to whether their characteristics are such as to make a happy combination. We can not judge very well as to that now but Mendelian investigation may furnish us a basis for judging in course of time.

Non-biological writers usually regard human hybridism as a bad thing when it is the result of a crossing between a so-called superior and a so-called inferior race. Their opinion is based upon the fact that these half-breeds are frequently failures in society. But such failure is usually due to social factors though these writers attribute it to the inborn traits of the half-breeds. Biologists regard hybridism in general as a good thing in the animate world at large and as an important factor in organic evolution. Biologists who have discussed human problems and anthropologists who are well grounded in biology have usually regarded human hybridism as a good thing and as an important factor in human mental and social evolution. So that it is probably true that human hybridism in general is a good thing. However, it would not be safe to argue from such a general principle in every specific case. It may be that under some conditions such as have been suggested above miscegenation is not a good thing. Furthermore, it is true that if a general movement towards a final racial amalgamation began many difficulties would arise as a result of the intimate contact of the races during the long period which this process would take and it might be questioned whether the benefits to be gained by a final amalgamation would more than counterbalance the difficulties of the transition period. And in any case as we have seen for climatic reasons such amalgamation may never be possible.

It is now evident that there are three possibilities as to ethnic relations in the future. The ethnic types may always remain distinct, though there will always be a certain amount of crossing between them as there always has been, while the different cultures will also remain distinct. Or the ethnic types may remain distinct but culture will become uniform the world over. Or a final racial amalgamation may take place with a uniform world-wide culture. Uniformity of culture would be the almost inevitable accompaniment of racial amalgamation so that we need not recognize the possibility of such amalgamation with a diversity of culture. I would not dare to express an opinion as to which of these possibilities is most likely to take place. But it is to be hoped in the interests of international peace that in course of time there will

be more or less uniformity of culture at least so far as political organization, moral ideas and systems of law are concerned.

The preceding has necessarily been a very brief discussion of a great subject and I regret very much that I have not the time to apply the broad generalizations which have been suggested to concrete examples. But I hope the discussion has been sufficient to indicate the importance of taking into consideration the ethnic factors in all international relations, as, for example, in the relations of two great European nations such as France and Germany, in the relations of the Balkan countries to their Asiatic foe, in the relations of a powerful nation to its subject peoples as the British in India, and in the relations of a great Occidental and great Oriental country such as the United States and Japan.

THE RELATIONS OF BUSINESS AND INTERNATIONAL PEACE

Saturday Afternoon, May 3, at 2 o'clock

SHELDON MEMORIAL ASSEMBLY HALL

LEROY A. GODDARD, PRESIDENT STATE BANK OF CHICAGO, Presiding

CHAIRMAN GODDARD:

According to the program we are to consider here at this hour the Relations of Business and International Peace. It is a self-evident proposition that these relations should be universally cordial and co-operative. The business men—men of affairs—ought to be most keenly interested in universal peace as an economic proposition. But it is a fact and this is a conservative statement, that the busy business men, those who are deeply immersed in the mad chase for money with an eye single to building up large propositions, are the hardest men to move and influence toward taking personal activity and personal interest in this work. If we succeed in getting the willing ear of even a portion of the business men of this country to realize the value of the co-operative relations of business and international peace, then our labors will certainly not be in vain.

A far-reaching impression has doubtless been made here in St. Louis. If we haven't made it here, when and how can it be made? We have never before had so large a proportion of the leading business men of any city show such an active, united and substantial interest in the proceedings to the extent that have been evinced here in connection with this congress. The United States is the leader of the world in commerce and in banking power, and now the indications are that it may become the leader of nations in the promulgation of universal peace.

When we succeed in convincing the people that loyalty and patriotism mean brotherhood, fraternity and good will in

the broadest sense then we will begin to overcome a deep-seated delusion that is forever an obstacle to our work. Loyalty to country means something more than an outward demonstration of enthusiasm for the flag, or of even a willingness to fight. This is not a cowardly attitude; nor is it unpatriotic. You know we have only had three or four years of wars against European foes in the last 125 years since the Revolution. We ought to be a people too busy to lose the time standing around waiting, and possibly hoping, for a fight. Surely loyalty must not be placed in the attitude of being a factory to manufacture loafers or bravadoes. True patriotism means loyalty to country in promoting its educational interests and its industrial and its commercial prosperity; a contribution towards its normal development. In other words true patriotism in its real meaning means a high ideal of individual citizenship, and the highest type of individual citizenship is service. Service for the conservation of human energy and of human life, and not its destruction, not in provoking causes for its destruction. That service which teaches and fosters the Fatherhood of God and the Brotherhood of Man among the nations of the earth. Commercial justice never demands the taking of human life, and the slaying of my brother can never be harmonized as a commercial necessity.

[The chairman introduced as the first speaker Robert C. Root, Director of the Pacific Coast department of the American Peace Society who spoke upon "The Mills of Industry on the Trail of Mars."]

The Mills of Industry on the Trail of Mars

ROBERT C. ROOT.

We are all familiar with the old Roman orator's favorite peroration, "Carthago delenda est," Carthage must be destroyed. And I would that we were more familiar and more insistent in the use of another saying that is far more important and apropos than the first, viz.: "Mars, god of war, is not immortal and must die."

Furthermore, I trust that this great Peace Congress may have a very significant part in the preliminary arrangements of that greatly to be desired funeral. And you will permit me to express the hope that we shall manifest as much zeal in the performance of our pleasant duty in that respect and exhibit as much becoming haste and discreet precaution therein, as was shown by a certain son-in-law, who, when asked over "long distance" whether the mortal remains of his late lamented mother-in-law should be embalmed, or cremated, or buried, replied with appropriate haste and suitable agitation, "Take no chances, embalm and cremate and bury." So let us do with Mars. Let's sterilize him and oslerize him and mummyize him at the earliest possible moment, and "take no chances" on his coming back to life again.

But if the foregoing words seem too facetious for serious minded peace folk, let us turn for a time to view some of the reasons why "we the people," as well as the prophets, may confidently look for the certain death of Mars, because the mills of industry are on the trail of the god of war.

Between the years 1763 and 1789 three very important inventions came into practical use in England. These were the spinning-jenny, the power loom and the steam engine. With some minor inventions these three mark the beginning of a great industrial transformation. England changed in due time from an agricultural country to an industrial nation. The reason for this change may be told in few words. England could not feed her own people, if she relied on the products of her own soil; hence, she was compelled to become a great manufacturing nation with merchant ships to carry her goods to all countries over the seas.

Since 1793 England has found it necessary to buy food from outside nations, and she now buys food 275 days out of every 365, or three-fourths of the entire year. One of her leading statesmen recently said that England, at any given time, has supplies within her borders to last her only six weeks. Evidently, since England can not produce food enough on her own soil to feed her people, she must feed them through the help of other nations.

But this is not the whole story of England's dependence upon her sister nations. She can not, for example, supply much of the raw material she uses in her mills that furnish employment for her laborers and food for her people. Surely, "no nation liveth unto itself nor dieth into itself" in the complex relations of the twentieth century civilization! But let us be still more specific. After she has secured all the cotton available in her colonies and dependencies, England is compelled to buy fully 3,000,000 bales or nearly \$200,000,000 worth of cotton annually from the United States.

About one year ago a company with \$25,000,000 capital was organized among English manufacturers for the sole purpose of extending the area of cotton culture in order that England might secure the larger part of the superior grade of cotton produced in the United States. It is evident to the English manufacturers that if they would lead the world in the production of fine cotton goods, they must have the best grades of cotton, and these grades are found in large quantities only in the United States, where eighty per cent of the world's cotton crop is grown.

It is interesting to note here the figures given in the April, 1913, Crop Reporter issued by the U. S. Secretary of Agriculture. It is there stated that up to the end of 1911 there had been expended in cotton culture experiments in colonial possessions by France \$300,000; by Germany \$500,000; by Russia \$2,440,328; and by England \$3,137,000. And yet it is the opinion of J. L. Watkins, cotton expert of our Department of Agriculture that the United States can maintain its lead of eighty per cent of the world's supply of cotton for many years to come.

This much concerning the main source of supply for the mills of industry, now what of the markets for the products of the mills? England's largest, best customer, paradoxical as it may seem, is Germany, her supposed worst enemy (?). Then follow the United States, France, other continental countries, South America and the Orient, or the "open doors" of the world. Why, then, with all her mills of industry supplying half her working classes, with labor, and with the

markets of the world "open doors" for her products, why is England face to face with such appalling conditions? Why need the Hon. David Lloyd George, Chancellor of the Exchequer and able statesman, declare that sixty per cent of the British workmen are underfed and live without sufficient nourishment? And why need Mrs. Snowden of England reveal the further appalling fact that 122,000 boys and girls go hungry to school every day in London alone? Must another Tom Hood sing another "Song of the Shirt," and cry aloud in behalf of suffering, starving men, women and children, "Oh God, that bread should be so dear, and human life so cheap?"

Has political economy no saving principle, have statesmen no remedy? Yes, let the peace hosts proclaim it the wide-world around. Yes, true economic law does contain the correcting principle, and the statesmanship of peace can provide the remedy.

Indeed, another English statesman, the Hon. Winston Churchill, First Lord of the Admiralty, in a recent speech pointed England to the way out of her distress. He stated that in common with her sister nations the British Empire has literally wasted millions to no purpose in adding to her already excessive armaments. And he proposed that this colossal folly and waste should cease for one year at least, and the true welfare of the people be the first consideration of the government. This suggestion is a most significant one; for it is a ray of light in the midst of the darkness, the chaos, the confusion that follow the adoption of the unsound, out-worn Machiavellian theories, and the enormous waste incident to the mad rivalry in armament because of mere suspicion or senseless hate or fake war scares fostered by Navy leagues or manufactured for cash profits by armor syndicates, ship trusts, and other vested interests.

It seems perfectly clear to a balanced, thinking mind, a peace man's mind for example, that more waste will not bring wealth or work for the needy. Now will the heavier taxes that follow because of that waste bring relief from burdens that have already reached the limit of endurance? And is it not plain, also, that the great armaments beget fear, and fear checks trade, and lessened trade blocks industry, and sluggish

industry lessens the demand for capital, and an inactive demand for capital falls grievously hard upon the laboring classes and want and misery are the results?

Just here let me recall to your minds an interesting fact. We are sometimes told, in all seriousness, that war helps business; but the records in Vienna, Austria, show that the business failures in January, 1913, were five and one-half times as many as the failures in January, 1912. Here is one case out of many that might be mentioned where a nation might seem to be in a position to profit by war, but fear and distrust and stagnation incident to war fell heavily upon business and then in turn quite as heavily upon labor and those dependent upon labor.

No thinking mind denies that war preparations do furnish a certain amount of employment; but my contention is that preparations for war of whatever nature are wasteful of capital and a gross injury to labor, and England's present distress is due largely to this waste and injury. And what is true of England is true of every country that wastes its capital and robs its laboring classes by wasteful expenditures on preparation for war.

Here let me point a moral and adorn a tale. Between my own city of Los Angeles and her port at San Pedro there has recently been built a new manufacturing town called Torrance. The land, the water, the streets, the electric lights, the mills and factories, and the homes for the 3,600 workman, are to cost \$8,820,000, or only three-fourths of the cost of a big battleship. Everything has been planned for comfort and for health, as well as for efficiency and for profit. Compare this expenditure with the cost of one of our big battleships, the "North Dakota." The battleship cost \$12,000,000 and will "employ" 1,000 men all told, including officers. I do not hesitate to say that the building of the town of Torrance gave labor quite as much benefit as did the building of the battleship; and besides, the mills of the town will require more than three and a half times as many laborers "to man" them as it will take "to man" the ship. And you must not forget that the laborers in the mills will receive higher wages than the "Jackies" on the North Dakota. Moreover, the mill own-

ers will receive a profit on the products of their mills while the battleship brings no return to its owners, but is run at a dead loss of \$1,000,000 per year. And the owners, "we, the people," pay for that waste and loss.

In fifteen or eighteen years the North Dakota will be thrown on the junk heap—a needless waste of \$12,000,000 in the beginning and a dead loss of \$15,000,000 or \$18,000,000 to mark the colossal folly of big navy statesmanship (?). Save the mark! On the other hand, the town of Torrance will increase in wealth and value each year and pay dividends to capital, give profitable employment to many laborers and add to the sum of human happiness.

Since my theme, "The Mills of Industry on the Trail of Mars" may rightly be interpreted to include any industry that is wisely economic in its nature, I will give another illustration of the waste of war compared with the benefits derived from a smaller expenditure made in the interest of human welfare.

Over in the Salt River Valley, Arizona, the United States Government has built the Roosevelt Dam at a cost of \$9,000,000. Behind this dam is stored water sufficient to irrigate 240,000 acres of good soil. Ten acres of this soil will support in comfort an average family of five. That means that 24,000 families, or 120,000 people, can be provided with means of support and the foundation of an independent income for life at an expense of \$9,000,000, not to mention the light and power supplied by the same water that is used to make the soil yield its treasures of wealth for the benefit and sustenance of a community of 120,000 people. In the light of such facts, to spend \$12,000,000 to \$15,000,000 on a single dreadnaught that supports at most 1,000 to 1,200 people, and in a few years "adorns" the scrap pile, is a crime against honest idle men and half-clad women and hungry children.

The illustrations used are from our own country (where many more just as forceful may be found), but if my time and your patience permitted I could give others quite as much to the point from every civilized country. The principles involved in these illustrations are not local, but general. They apply with equal force to the cotton mills or transportation facilities of England, to the factories and mines of Germany,

the silk mills or small industries of France, or to the industries and factories of far off India, China or Japan; for everywhere and under all conditions economic waste tends to poverty and inefficiency.

The lesson is plain. Stop the waste, lessen the burdens, cut down or rather, "cut out" the war taxes. Stop the mills of death and destruction and set whirring the mills of industry. Let England take her millions of tribute to Mars and cast them into the lap of industry, and the poet may again sing of "Merrie England;" for then her sons could be fed and their wives be glad and their children go singing, not hungry, to school.

Let Germany take her soldiers from the backs of her toilers and empty her war chest so that factories and furnaces may glow. Then, free from war taxes and the clutch of the money lender the sons of the Fatherland could truly sing most contentedly, "My Heart is on the Rhine." And let our own nation cease her waste on needless army posts, fourth-rate navy yards, unnecessary battleships and "Militia Pay Bills," and use that waste in protecting the lives of our own people from devastating floods, if we would do the things that become statesmen and patriots.

And France and Russia and Austria and Italy and Japan, not to mention Turkey and the Balkan states, all need to "right about face," as well as England and Germany and the United States, if these countries are to develop their natural resources, provide for the general welfare of their people, and in nearly every case avoid financial bankruptcy. Industrial development is their only hope of escape from impending disaster. They can not continue the mad rivalry in armaments and the economic waste that follows and develop their industries sufficiently to maintain their increasing population in comfort and make them efficient as producers of wealth and also remain sound in health and full of vigor.

But the "peace man's" policy has another benefit of vast significance. The turning of the waste of war into industrial channels would not only give better returns to capital, but it would give more and better employment for labor, furnish more food and clothing for the needy, if needy there were, and lighten the burdens of taxation and lessen the high cost

of living. Surely, these are sufficient to claim the attention of statesmen, but they are not all!

Let me here remind you of an earlier statement in this discussion viz.: that the United States produces eighty per cent of all the raw cotton of the world, and is in a position to maintain this leadership for many years to come. The mills of England must shut down if they can not get our American cotton. The same is true of the mills of Germany, France and indeed every European country. In 1911 Europe exported \$400,000,000 worth of cotton goods to the Orient. Europe could not have supplied ten per cent, or \$40,000,000 worth, without the raw cotton from the United States. At the Palace Hotel, San Francisco, Cal., on March 22d of this year (1913), Mr. A. Yamada, a director in the Japan Cotton Trading Company of Osaka, stated that he had "just purchased 160,000 bales of Texas cotton at a cost of \$9,600,000." And Mr. Yamada further stated that "in 1912 Japan purchased \$100,000,000 worth of cotton and the greater part of this was imported direct from the United States." Even India and China import no insignificant quantities of cotton from "Uncle Sam."

Are not these "the ties that bind" the nations to us in friendly intercourse and peace? Better than dreadnaughts or bristling guns are these industrial messengers of good-will in protecting us from foreign attack; for the prosperity, the life-blood of the countries named depend on the supplies they must have from our cotton fields and other sources of wealth.

Could anything show more clearly than these illustrations the mutual interests, the mutual dependence, of nation upon nation? And this mutual dependence has been growing, is growing, and will continue to grow as civilization advances. And is it not clear also that war is the arch-enemy of such progress and that the mills of industry are very near the center of this problem of peace?

Was not Sir Charles Macara of England right when in Berlin in October, 1911, as he presided over a convention representing twenty-two countries, he used these words: "The value of the international trade of the great powers of

Europe was so enormous that on these grounds alone war between them was unthinkable, since it would be ruinous to victors and vanquished alike?"

But the facts here presented are the very ones that the "war party" ignore. They plant their feet on mediæval clay, steadfastly gaze on things as they were but now are not. They ignore the most salient facts of the present and inevitably draw wrong conclusions from their false premises. What then is the remedy? Turn on the light of truth. One of the ablest teachers of history in the United States and an authority on historical matters, Prof. H. Morse Stephens, Oxford graduate, and professor of History in the University of California, in speaking not long since to a group of history teachers (myself included) said: "History has not been properly taught until quite recently, and the wrong teaching of history accounts for much of the warlike attitude among the nations of Europe."

The "way out" is clearly seen. Transform the waste of war into industrial energy. Write history that reveals the true conditions of the people and shows the industrial developments and the ever-increasing dependence of nation upon nation. Place such histories and Norman Angell's "Great Illusion" in the hands of the millions upon millions of youth now in the schools of every land. Show them that the greatest good, the highest statesmanship and the truest patriotism are found in maxim: "For native land through the peace of the world." With a thought from Longfellow, I conclude:

"Were half the power that fills the world with terror;
 Were half the wealth bestowed on camps and courts
 Given to redeem the human mind from error,
 There were no need of arsenals and forts."

For then the mills of industry could satisfy all of the material needs of men.

[Mr. Eugene Levering, President of the National Bank of Commerce of Baltimore followed Mr. Root, his subject being "How War Affects Business."]

How War Affects Business

EUGENE LEVERING, of Baltimore.

What is implied in this question? Not only and not primarily the effects of an actual conflict between armed forces, not those disastrous effects to life, property and business which accompany such a conflict. All this, yes, but war in its effect upon business has an antecedent relation, and then it has, of course, a very direct influence upon current business while the struggle lasts, and again, it has subsequent relations and it is well for us to consider the question from these three standpoints.

First, then, antecedently: But you ask, how can war have any effect on business before there is a war? The mere raising of such a question furnishes its own solution, for we all know, that though the whole world were at peace, which unfortunately it is not at this moment, the fear of war, the preparations for war constitute a most serious menace to business today a most heavy burden upon business in its larger and general sense.

What is the meaning of the phrase, "In time of peace prepare for war?" And that other two-word sentence "armed peace?" What do these mean and how do they affect business? Have you heard anything about a tight money market during the past six months? Yes, for almost a year. Have you heard anything of a serious decline in all the best recognized securities in the land, State and Municipal and underlying railroad bonds? Have you heard anything of the effort of some countries in Europe, particularly Germany, to borrow large sums from us offering as high as eight per cent interest? Have you heard of great corporations, large manufacturing industries not being able to secure the money necessary to make needed expansion? Have you heard of States and Cities having to postpone their offering of new and necessary issues or forced to pay almost unheard of rates of interest?

Witness, as regards this latter the recently announced issue of N. Y. City four and one-half per cent bonds. Can such conditions continue without effecting sooner or later,

even more seriously than is already the case, the business interests of this country. These causes, I grant may have contributed to produce the existing money stringency the world over, but can not this stringency be directly traced to the exhausting drain upon the material resources of the main countries of the world for military and naval purposes, to the continuous and apparently unnecessary preparation making by most of these countries, and I regret to say by the United States also, in the vain attempt to preserve peace by preparing for war. And if you ask any one of these nations for what war are they preparing, by these vast expenditures, silence is the only answer. You have had your attention called to the enormous extent of these expenditures on more than one occasion, but simply to stir up your peaceful minds by way of remembrance, to paraphrase an apostolic saying; let me refer to these again and for this purpose, I will read an extract from a recent editorial of the N. Y. Journal of Commerce bearing on this subject:

"Fully to appreciate the weight of the burden which the great nations of Europe are assuming, the fact should be recalled that the cost of the German army and navy has risen from a total of \$203,000,000 in 1900 to nearly double that amount today. To put the case in another way, between 1900 and 1912 Germany's military expenditures increased 45½ per cent while during the same period her naval expenditure was trebled. That the leading characteristic of the Twentieth Century has been an enormous expansion in the armaments of the principal nations is sufficiently plain from the following figures: The eight great powers, Germany, Austria-Hungary, Italy, France, Russia, Great Britain, the United States and Japan—had in 1900 a total military expenditure of \$936,500,000 which by 1912 had increased to \$1,239,500,000. During the same period the naval expenditures of these eight powers increased from \$436,000,000 to \$768,500,000. In other words, there was an increase in the military expenditure of \$303,000,000 or 32½ per cent while naval expenditures had increased \$332,500,000 or 75 per cent. The combined increase of naval and military expenditure between 1900 and 1912 was \$635,000,000 or 45½ per cent. But in this interval the population of the eight great powers enumerated has increased only by about 15 per cent, while their combined expenditure on armament has grown three times as rapidly. During 1912, the eight great powers for which figures have been given, spent all together the colossal sum of \$2,005,000,000 on their armies and navies. If to this sum be added the military expenditure of the smaller powers,

it will be found that last year about \$2,500,000,000 was spent on armaments. As a matter of fact the cost of armed peace was considerably more than this, for as Mr. J. Ellis Barker points out, all great European States, Great Britain alone excepted, compel the able-bodied youth of the country to abandon their occupation and to serve in the army and navy. Four million men are constantly kept under arms in Europe. Thus, if we estimate the economic loss caused by diminished production and abandoned study only at \$5 per soldier per week, or at \$250 per soldier per year, we find that the nations lost in 1912 \$1,000,000,000 in addition to the \$2,500,000,000 spent by the taxpayers."

How much longer can the people of these countries stand up under such a burden, how long will they? And when the moment comes to reject this present system of antecedent militarism in part or in whole, something will happen. And do you for one moment think that their business and all that is involved by that word, will not have to contribute its share of the price? But do not imagine, that this, our own country is free from such a policy, the only difference really being that of degree and not of kind. What of the \$200,000,000 now being spent for pensions? Remember that up to 1879, fourteen years after the Civil War, this expenditure only amounted to something like \$30,000,000 annually, but by the passage of the Arrears Pension Act, in that year, the amount has steadily increased until now, as stated, it approximates \$200,000,000, and who knows whether it has yet reached its limit? Is not this in itself a great burden upon the industries and the general business interests of the country, even granting that much might be said in defense, I will not say as to the wisdom of this expenditure?

Separate from and in addition to this, look at the steadily increasing amounts being expended by our Government for military and naval purposes now amounting to some \$300,000,000 per annum or about \$1,000,000 for each working day, if Mr. Carnegie's figures given in his address on last Thursday, are correct. Yet this does not satisfy those whose constant Shibboleth is "In time of peace prepare for war."

Look at the constant efforts making for the construction of two or three dreadnaughts and super-dreadnaughts, each costing approximately \$15,000,000, or enough, to quote Mr.

Carnegie again, "To provide suitable buildings for at least sixty of our own foreign embassies; nor is this all, what about that measure, steadily but quietly being urged upon Congress entitled The Militia Pay Bill?" Did you ever hear of it? This bill calls for the payment by the National Government of a certain sum to every person who may enlist in the Militia of the various States, the amount being based upon a percentage of the pay at present received by the officers and enlisted men of the Regular Army. The Government is already appropriating some \$5,000,000 for the support and encouragement of the militia of the country, perhaps a reasonable expenditure, but who can estimate should this bill become a law, what the expenditure under it, would in the course of a few years amount to. It would, I fear be true in this case as in the case of the pension appropriation, that a thing grows upon what it is fed.

Perhaps fortunately, as regards our country, though it might be questioned, we meet these enormous expenditures amounting if I remember correctly, to something like seventy per cent of the entire expense of our Government, by taxing in one shape or another our own people and as yet without any great hue and cry being raised. But, look at the conditions elsewhere. The Bureau of Statistics of the United States Department of Commerce and Labor gives the total indebtedness of the principal countries of the world, largely the result of actual war, and the preparation for war, at over thirty-four billion dollars annually, interest on which amounts to over one billion dollars. Does anyone need any further answer to the question that war, the preparation for war, or even the rumors of war, affects unfavorably the business interests of the country. Our country alike with others.

Now, secondly and briefly, what as to the effect of war during the period of its actual existence? That will depend largely upon the kind of business one is engaged in and where the business itself is located. War we know, stimulates very decidedly certain lines of business, while it paralyzes others, but even then can there be anything but a net loss in the aggregate to the business of any country when you count the cost of the withdrawal of large numbers of men from the

peaceful and producing avocations of life and turn them into as many machines for the destruction of human beings? Somebody has to pay the bill finally. But, to really estimate the effect of war upon business, one's own business, for after all, we can not ignore the personal equation, we must see it at first hand, that is where the results of war touch him personally.

What do you suppose is the present status of business in South Eastern Europe? Has war been profitable commercially to those countries involved as they have been recently in such a terrible struggle? Did prosperity and development come to the Southern States during the years of the Civil War? Only those who lived there and went through that period can give any adequate description of the loss, yes, practically the annihilation of all the business interests of those States. Surely no one will deny that war spells ruin to business interests of that section which becomes the theater of the actual conflict.

Just a word now, in conclusion, as to the subsequent effects of war upon business, that is, after the war itself may have closed. Here again, some individual and local interest may not only not be injured, but may on the contrary seem to prosper, but how often does history reveal the fact that though the country has been successful from a military point of view, yet it has had to pay the price of war. I do not now refer merely to the money cost nor to the long death roll, nor to the actual destruction of property nor even to any temporary embarrassment to its business interests that may be occasioned; these do go in the account and become a part of the after-effects which the successful country has to carry, and consequently become additional burdens upon the resources financial and commercial of that country, which, however, some nations seek to partially lessen from time to time by transferring the financial burden in whole or in part in the shape of loans to subsequent generations. There is still another effect, an after-effect of war, which I have more in mind as applicable to the successful nation, I refer to what seems to be an inevitable tendency, viz.: that under such circumstances, there develops a lowering of the ethical standards of business life and moral ideas of the people. I have not the

time to develop this thought, or rather fact, just two illustrations of comparatively recent date will suffice. I referred, a few moments since to what the Civil War cost the South, did it cost the North nothing? What about the wild haste to get rich which was engendered almost immediately with the outbreak of the Civil War, from which we are only now beginning clearly to emerge. What about the shoddy clothes, the paper soled shoes, the falsely packed and falsely weighed articles, furnished by the supposedly patriotic men of those days, to the Government for the support of the troops in the field. And these simply indicate what was occurring practically in all departments and relations of the Government. Special cases you say, and not general. Yes, mayhap, but symptoms all the same of the lowering of the moral tone of the people under the rush and pressure of a suddenly developed opportunity to make money rapidly which later took on the form of a more or less recognized and accepted method of business as exemplified in the occurrences of Black Friday, that dark and disastrous day in our country's history; followed by the several other panics which passed over the country, traceable more or less to the same causes not to omit the famous or I might almost say infamous railroad exploitations, of the earlier days, and then of the insurance scandals a later development. These and other symptoms, if you insist upon calling them, but facts still, demonstrate the natural and inevitable result of inordinate desires for wealth generated as the concomitant of or after-effects of war.

The other illustration I had in mind was the effect of the Franco-Prussian War upon Germany itself, a reference to which will have to suffice, as my time is up. Looked at from every standpoint, are we not therefore justified in saying that the effects of war upon business in its individual as well as its world-wide relationship are detrimental financially and morally, creating conditions from which both the present and succeeding generations must suffer. Let us not undervalue the fact that the blessings of peace and the real, the lasting benefits of Commerce are indissolubly joined together, and what God has economically joined, let no man put asunder.

[Jacob G. Schmidlapp, of the Union Savings Bank and Trust Company of Cincinnati, delivered the next address, his subject being "International Credit and War."]

International Credit and War

JACOB G. SCHMIDLAPP, of Cincinnati.

Go up and down your principal street and it will be difficult to find a man opposed to furthering International Peace. But how to insure it, is the question. Whether through a lavish expenditure in preparing for war, or the more economic basis such as has been practiced in this country until within recent years.

In the art of government the statesman naturally measures the future by the past, and he is too often influenced to join the militarist and say preparation for war insures peace.

The captain of industry with courage enough to take a reasonable risk realizes that as the interchange of commodities and the facilities for travel increase, and as we thereby become better acquainted with peoples of other nations, the possibilities of war lessen. He believes that in the popular form of government lower taxes encourage patriotism more than do large navies. He not only believes in making friends, but in making reasonable concessions in order to keep them. He claims our geographic and economic position is such that we need not fear attack from the outside, and as the world's largest consumer today, there can be no cause for our ever being refused any reasonable concessions from the advanced nations of the world. Hence it is beyond our dignity to make unreasonable demands. No manufacturing nation of the world could close our ports today without crippling or closing its own factories.

In advancing the cause we are now proclaiming, the business man is our strongest ally. Commerce among nations means increased understanding, therefore lessens the chances of war. The ship laden with merchandise that sails from our ports is the harbinger of peace, and each ton of freight received by it is its hostage. Moreover, it is significant of the broader views of affairs that those who have traveled in foreign coun-

tries, and who are familiar with commerce between nations, are not easily alarmed over the intimations of war.

Let us consider for a moment a few of our international disputes of recent years. The most important was of course that with Spain, as it ended in an unnecessary war. I have it from no less an authority than President McKinley, that if he had been let alone there would have been no war with Spain. He said Spain was granting our requests one after another, and he was sure that by diplomacy he could have gained every point our people were entitled to.

We can understand how an intelligent mind can honestly say that we have a perfect right to exempt our coastwise vessels from Panama Canal tolls, but the business man doubts if it is advisable to do so. He says England is one of our best customers, and should be treated liberally as such. Besides, he says it is not fair to our own people who have no interest in transportation from the East to the West coast, to be taxed for vessels passing through the Canal.

Again, the same may be said of our present dispute with Japan. An intelligent mind must admit that California has a perfect right to make such conditions as she chooses regarding alien land ownership. Knowing the Japanese, and knowing our strong position, as I have heretofore indicated, as a customer, the business man says, "Why offend these people, when by diplomacy they will be delighted to grant any reasonable request." The intelligent Japanese are perfectly familiar with our economic conditions, and know well that this country can not afford to harbor as competitors of the laboring class the cheap paid labor of Japan or China. And they also know that the success of the future of their production depends largely upon our patronage. The business man knows that the future growth of international trade lies largely in the far East and when that day comes Japan's friendship to us will be as valuable as is England's today.

The instinct to protect the fair name of one's country and to resent a supposed insult, is of course one of the strongest instincts in the individual, and one most quick to result in impulsive action. It is also an instinct which at any cost must be preserved, but, as with the individual, it is always more

heroic to live a daily consistent life in the face of hardships than to destroy one's life, so it seems that patriotism for one's country can be more effectively proven by patient effort to work out through arbitration relationships which conduce to the country's entire welfare, than by rash action, satisfying simply a temporary flame of sentiment.

Our legislators, in compiling their budgets and levying taxes upon our people, regard millions too lightly. To them the amounts become mere figures, and sometimes lose their significance. When we criticise the amount expended annually for the navy, we are met with the answer that England expends considerably more, and that Germany with one-third our wealth, devotes as much to her navy. But let us pause a moment and seek to appreciate what this vast expenditure means; to what proportions will this burden grow with the advance of years? One hundred and fifty million dollars per year, figuring on a five per cent basis, the value I place upon capital in the hands of the tax-payer, will in a single generation make an amount of twelve thousand million dollars, and in two generations more than one-half the present wealth of the nation. You may say we are here playing with figures, but this does give some idea of the world's waste in preparing for war. It is time to pause not only in thought, but in the creating of vast armaments whose ultimate purpose is destruction, not production. We were told by England, and now by Germany, that if we want to send our commodities to all parts of the world it is necessary to have a navy to protect them, but the day when you can force people to trade with you has gone, or is rapidly disappearing. By general consent the open door has come in its place, and when the benefit of trading with other countries is mutual, as it should be, there will be no necessity of a naval escort for our merchant marine.

Again, is the preparation for war a permanence of peace? If morality for individuals is morality for nations, why should not the ethics of the individual be the ethics among nations? Has not the preparation for defense in the individual stained more hands with blood than all other causes combined? The man who carries a weapon is the most dangerous in the community. This impressed itself upon me during my early life

as a resident of Memphis, where murder was so frequent that laws had to be passed prohibiting the sale of firearms. The business man believes that this same danger may be encouraged by nations in being continually prepared for war.

Last year we had the pleasure of entertaining in this country the Congress of the World Scientists, where eleven hundred foreigners were given a personal introduction to our people. A little later we also entertained the Industrial Commercial Congress, where we had the pleasure of meeting over four hundred business men from all parts of the world. These two meetings alone were worth more to this country in the advancement of International Peace than the building of any battleship, and in support of such conventions as these the business man will join, believing that they make more friends, and therefore more chances for peace than does a display of dreadnaughts.

AMERICAN PEACE SOCIETY

EIGHTY-FIFTH ANNUAL MEETING

Saturday Afternoon, May 3, at 4 o'clock

THE ODEON

UNITED STATES SENATOR THEODORE E. BURTON, Presiding

PRESIDENT BURTON:

The day for the meeting of the American Peace Society has arrived, and I regret that I am compelled to leave promptly at 4:30, and so I ask the meeting to come to order. A few minutes I wish to briefly review the progress of the peace movement for the last two years, say since the last Peace Congress at Baltimore, then, if I have time, to offer some practical suggestions in regard to the future work of the American Peace Society and affiliated organizations. There is no denying that several discouraging events have occurred for lovers of peace during the last two years. The war between Italy and Tripoli was apparently an unprovoked attack of the stronger power upon the weaker, but if we seek for the fundamental cause, it was the disposition of the more powerful nations of the earth to exploit and gain for themselves any fertile countries where the residents or occupants are not seeking to improve them. That is the justification for England, Germany and France, and in a measure Italy, to establish spheres of influence; to divide up the tropical portions of the earth and those localities populated by weak people among themselves.

The lovers of peace may feel sure that this movement has practically expended itself. The second unfortunate occurrence was the war in the Balkan peninsula. It was well stated this morning that one cause of that was the inefficient government of Turkey, but there was another cause there—the survival of racial and religious hatreds running through cen-

turies. We may be sure that this also, with all of its barbarity, will soon have spent its force, and if we look over the broad earth there is no other place where there is reason for a similarity of conduct. We may earnestly hope that this will be the last contest in which religious animosity will be the leading factor. There is no denying that the advocates of peace also were in a measure discouraged by the rejection of the arbitration treaties last year. I regret very much that they were not accepted by the Senate in the form in which they came from the White House as approved by the Government of England and by the Executive Department of the United States. They were ratified, but in a form in which both chancellories thought it best not to accept. There have been two distinct forms of arbitration treaties in the last ten years. The first was the treaty between France and Great Britain of 1903-04, which furnished the model of other treaties between France, Great Britain, Spain and Italy, and our own country. These treaties marked a very positive step in the history of arbitration, but all contain the exception of honor, independence, vital interest and controversies in which the interest of third parties were involved. It is plain to anyone to see in a time of excitement and tension of war how any nation may run to any one of the first two, or perhaps the first three of those, to say "our honor is involved, our vital interests are involved, our independence is involved," or the interests of third parties are involved. Though we are all glad treaties were adopted even containing those exceptions, they are nevertheless far from complete. No treaty is fully complete that contains those words.

For instance, in the discussion of the Panama Canal controversy, while I do not think it was very seriously urged, some stated vital interest is involved in this. Others said honor is involved. Indeed, Lord Russell said when the Alabama claims were under consideration that it would never be consistent with the honor of Great Britain to submit those claims to arbitration. Fortunately he was overruled.

Now, that is the situation. Those exceptions will prevent the orderly progress of arbitration. Treaties presented by President Taft were based upon controversial questions of

legal right justiciable. The general ideas of those treaties was to adopt, or at least make great progress on the way for the final adoption of the same principle in controversies between nations as that which has been made in controversies between individuals. There were two classes of controversies to be submitted. One, those concerning which the Executive Departments of both countries had agreed that they were justiciable. The other was the case in which the Executive Department of one country agreed that the controversy was justiciable and in which the other country denied. In this second case the question was to be submitted to a Commission of Inquiry and if that commission decided the question was justiciable, it was then submitted to arbitration, subject to the ratification of the Senate. Indeed, even had both Executive Departments regarded the controversy as justiciable, it was necessary that the Senate pass upon the issue. It was questioned, if you remember, whether under the second clause, after the Commission of Inquiry had found the question to be justiciable it did not immediately go to the arbitration without the intervention of the Senate. I think the plainer language of the treaty was against that interpretation. But an unfortunate controversy arose in which some, very fond of prerogatives of the Senate, stood in the way of the ratification of the treaty in that form. I think that, as was expressed this morning, was the highwater mark in the progress of arbitration, and I very much regret that the treaties were not finally ratified by the Senate, because I have been told not only would Germany have followed. Treaties had already been arranged between the United States and England and France, and Germany was ready to follow, and Japan was anxiously waiting for an opportunity to frame a similar treaty, but we must take conditions as they are.

Now, there is another proposition that is suggested by Secretary of State Bryan and President Wilson. That is that treaties shall be made between the United States and foreign countries under which it shall be provided that in case of a controversy which can not be settled by diplomacy, that controversy shall be submitted to a commission, and the commission shall at a date to be agreed upon, one year preferably,

make a report upon it, and during that year no declaration of war shall be made by either party. In fact, it is Mr. Bryan's desire that no preparation for war be made by either party. It is not an agreement for settlement of the controversy, but it is an agreement to throw light upon it by an investigation and to delay until passions are cooled. While I differ from Mr. Bryan in many things and probably shall differ from him in the future, I most heartily approve that plan as an improvement on any arbitration treaty which we now have. The substantial basis of it is this: that complete information must give that tribute which some nations and peoples have to these ideas of national honor and not demand that the decision of this commission be final and binding. But there is to be ample time for consideration, for the yellow press to spend its force, for passions to subside, and for an intelligent impartial commission to find the facts.

There is an analogous case in labor disputes. The general sentiment of organized labor has been against compulsory arbitration, but in several states, notably Massachusetts, the greatest benefit has been accomplished by the action of an official commission which takes the evidence, hears both sides and then makes its report upon the merits of the controversy upon the facts. In the long run public opinion is the greatest force in the world. And after this commission has clarified the situation, taken testimony, made its report, that side which is in the wrong can not stand up against public opinion, whether it be of the citizenship of a state or whether it be of the greater citizenship of the world.

There is one objection made to this proposition of Mr. Bryan. It is that if the proposed form of treaty was made between two countries, after a controversy had arisen and the commission created to take testimony they could not agree not to add to their military preparations because a third country might threaten one of the two. An illustration was given. Suppose there should be a controversy between the United States and Germany and their dispute should be submitted to a commission and they both agreed not to increase their military preparations in the meantime until the commission should report, and then some outside nation should

threaten the United States or Germany. That outside nation might go on with its military preparation while these two were prevented from preparing themselves from attack. In any event, my friends, the course of peace was never more hopeful than today. (Applause.)

The things that discourage us are part of the great movement of the time. We deplore the enormous expense in building battleships, etc. This is an age of the highest form of mechanism, the most perfect equipment and appliances. I do not mention this for one minute as justifying the mad race in building battleships. But a powerful impetus is given to the movement by the fact that this is a time of great progress along mechanical lines. The enormous expense of this naval and military program is more and more every minute making an impression upon people. I think it very fortunate that there has been a great exposure in one of the countries of Continental Europe showing that there was a military propaganda maintained by the men who were interested in the building of battleships and ordnance and furnishing supplies for those in the military program. It will open the eyes of people so that they may know these periodical war scares are not without a certain degree of method; that there is a movement behind them which often causes them where there is no possible basis for them. So I say to you all, "Be of good courage, continue steadfast in your work."

I am especially anxious that the membership of the American Peace Society should increase. If there is any one thing that discourages me in politics it is a small attendance. People are not interested in any cause apparently unless there is some immediate, selfish interest behind it. There is an exception to that when the hearts of the people are strongly touched and when emotion is aroused. But in this present age of great material development, with the increase in wealth building, the subjects which awaken the greatest attention are the obtaining of appropriations from the Government for something which adds to the quality or quantity of our exports and our trade. I have sometimes thought that I would like it much better if we ceased giving so much attention to increased bank deposits, increased production of iron and steel,

to the great preponderance of exports over imports, and gave more time to those things which more nearly affect humanity. (Applause.)

Now if this Peace Society, and all who are interested in the subject expect to succeed along legislative lines you must organize. You must make it known to the legislators and others that you are a political force in this country. In the last twenty-five years or so in which I have been connected with public life I have known the scale to be turned on a measure by a swarm of telegrams sent in at the last minute showing that people were interested in a certain subject on one side or on the other. It will be necessary to adopt in some degree the same methods that others employ. The sentiment is all on your side. It is not difficult to awaken all these various interests on behalf of peace. The business man sees that his work, whether it is in manufacture or in commerce, is a part of a great movement in which the whole world has its solidarity, it is his interest, merchant or manufacturer, unless he is the manufacturer of war material, to maintain peace to the utmost bounds of the earth. The mechanic, the artisan, the workman knows that, if really the facts were brought home to him, the greatest burdens of war are laid upon his back. Just think of what might happen if improvements could be made in the way of parks and streets and better houses from the money that is spent on military and naval expenditures. It is so with every class of society. There must be a campaign of education as well as a political campaign. It must be understood by those who represent you at Washington that you are interested in the cause of peace and arbitration. I really believe there is no cause that you will find it more easy to awaken interest in than this very cause of peace.

I have said repeatedly that there is this satisfaction. Men and women have labored from time immemorial in causes where success was doubtful, where the balance was trembling between success and failure; men have given their noblest efforts to objects where they didn't know whether the sun would rise upon them or not; but you who labor for truth,

for peace, may be sure that just so sure as this civilization of ours makes progress, which it is making, war year by year will become more and more a thing of the past. (Applause.)

I am very glad to introduce to you Dr. Mitchell, the president of the University of South Carolina, who will now address you on "The Demand for Peace." I regret that I must say, "Good afternoon" to Dr. Mitchell and you all. I must leave at this time. I will ask, in my absence, that Mr. Leroy A. Goddard, president of the Chicago Branch may take the chair. (Applause.)

The Demand for Peace

S. C. MITCHELL.

This is the eighty-fifth anniversary of the organization of the American Peace Society. For seventy years this organization worked with comparatively little hope and small fruit. Within the last fifteen years it has accomplished far more than in the seventy preceding, I take it. The greater honor, therefore, to the men and women, who in the day of small things in faith, in contributions and hope builded better than they knew. (Applause.) How little the group that met fifteen years ago expected that they were upon the eve of the big development which you and I are privileged to witness and share as the result of their labors. The first Hague Conference just to come. Arbitration treaties entered into by the score. International sentiment of the first order awaiting the second Hague Conference, and all that we know with reference to the readiness of the leading governments of the world to give effect to the mind of the people in favor of peace. Standing, therefore, as we do at the eighty-fifth anniversary we are able to look forward to what will be true when the one hundredth anniversary of the American Peace Society is celebrated. Certain things are immediately before us; and the mind of America has been formulated clearly to some extent by this very congress. I think it is appropriate here that we should, in returning to our homes, go with the confidence that some of these things of which we have spoken here will speedily come to pass. It is a significant fact that the three recent Secretaries

of State have vied with one another in advancing the cause of peace. It is a question to be asked whether the American Government has not, in the last two administrations, been in advance even of the thought of the people of this country in regard to international peace. I do not express a judgment. I am glad that Senator Burton threw light upon those recent seemingly discouraging facts, but it seems to me that there is a silver lining to that cloud.

May we not look forward to the revival of those treaties, arbitration treaties with England and France, and may we not anticipate the conclusion of the one that Secretary Bryan and President Wilson have already proclaimed and are admirably pressing. May we not look forward likewise to that legal peace that Mr. Carnegie held up before us. May we not look forward to the establishment of that international court of arbitral justice for which the nations of the earth have long and seriously dreamed.

Coming over on the train I was with a gentleman in the Department of Agriculture of the United States, and I rejoice to be in the city of its principal, the distinguished Secretary of Agriculture, the Chancellor of Washington University, David F. Houston. (Applause.) He was telling me another instance of trained talent called into public life. I fancy that this is the distinguishing mark of recent administrations, changing the thought of our American people that in order to secure public office it is not sufficient that a man be able to tell a funny story, perhaps a little obscene; he must have a trained mind and the disinterested spirit, the spirit of social service and a knowledge and grasp of the department which he proposes to handle. That is the new thing in the political life of America. Well, so much for that reference to Dr. Houston. I asked this gentleman what was the appropriation for the Department of Agriculture and he said, "We get about \$18,000,000 a year." We are primarily an agricultural people, some sections of our great country wholly agricultural. Think of the tremendous benefit that that \$18,000,000 accomplishes for our people, the rank and file of our people who are the backbone of our country. You recall Lincoln most loved the plain people of this country. I think the

nationalizing effect of the work of the administration, especially in the South, has done more to change the feelings of our people to the Government and to make them love it because of the helping hand that it extends, the hand of helpfulness, than all the political contingents combined within the last decade. That is what a little money wisely expended along practical lines will do for our people. I know of a single man, aided and advised by the national Department of Agriculture, who has lengthened the staple of cotton a fraction of an inch and thereby added millions to the income of southern commonwealths.

Then we turn from that eighteen millions given to the Department of Agriculture to what we dissipate upon our armies and navies, and it runs into hundreds and hundreds of millions. Now, I say, there is something for every one of us to do when we return home in creating public opinion. We have undertaken the task of encouraging arbitration treaties and arbitral justice, and grand as those enterprises are, we have undertaken the task of making for mankind a new patriotism that will embrace all of the advantages in the older patriotisms.

In closing I wish to express what I am sure everyone here feels, the profoundest gratitude to this great city for its hospitality, and the thought that in a city named after one of the first arbitrators in history, Saint Louis, there has been growing an impulse that will spread through the length and breadth of the world. I am exceedingly grateful to you for your kind attention. (Applause.)

CHAIRMAN GODDARD:

I appreciate the honor of being called upon to preside over the remaining deliberations of this body. I hope that Senator Burton noticed how easy it was to elect me his successor so that after a few more years if he gets tired of his job in the United States Senate I might be induced to locate in Ohio. We are all disappointed, of course, that he had to leave, and I am not going to add to your disappointment by taking up your time, but I have an announcement to make, and that is this. We are going to proceed now with the annual

business of the American Peace Society and I want to ask specially that you all remain. The proceedings may be a little more interesting than you think they will be. At least they are not going to be tiresome. I think you are all interested in the American Peace Society and I hope those of you who can, whether you are members or not, do us the compliment of remaining. If you can not remain we know that it is necessary that you retire. Those of you who are members of the American Peace Society Dr. Trueblood would like to have come down nearer to the front, and any of you that are not members can come nearer also. But the members especially he would like to have right down near where you can take part in the proceedings. These proceedings will not be lengthy and they will not be tedious. That we will promise you. And you need not begin to count your change because we are not going to take up a collection.

SECRETARY TRUEBLOOD:

You might suppose from the report that the American Peace Society is making money and liable to become rich. The balance of \$8,025.14 that we had last year was simply an accumulated surplus because we had not yet got our full working force, which did not come on until the first of November, so that the receipts and expenditures during the year have been nearly the same. We have received during the year \$4,000 plus a certain interest in legacies. Of that, \$3,000 was put into our reserve fund and invested and the other thousand into the general expense account. Some years ago the Board of Directors adopted the policy of putting such legacies as were not absolutely needed for current expenses into the reserve fund. That reserve fund has increased by the addition of legacies until we now have stocks and bonds of the par value of \$13,900, of the market value of \$14,694.25. The treasurer, George W. White, who signs this report respectfully submits it. I might say that this balance, this surplus which we have in hand, stands us in very good stead, because with our present working force of two men in our office at Washington with three office secretaries and with our force of five field department

directors at New York, Boston, Atlanta, Chicago, and one in Los Angeles, California, soon to change his headquarters to San Francisco, we shall have a very heavy draft with the outgo for literature and other essentials, so that this seemingly large balance, unless we find a source of revenue which we do not now know of, is sure to dwindle to almost nothing before the end of the year.

CHAIRMAN GODDARD:

We will next hear the report of the Board of Directors.

SECRETARY TRUEBLOOD:

The Board of Directors offer, as their annual report this year, the special reports of the Executive Director, Mr. Arthur D. Call, and the Secretary, myself, to them. Under our new constitution both the Executive Director and the Secretary are required to make a special report to the Board of Directors. Then the Board of Directors submit these two reports as the annual report of the society to you. I will say that this annual report has been sent out to all of the members of the Board of Directors through the country of which there are twenty-eight and so far as they have been heard from pretty generally they have given their approval to this as their report.

[The full and very interesting report of Director Arthur Deerin Call is given elsewhere in the proceedings of the "Conference on Organization for the Promotion of International Peace" held Thursday afternoon.]

CHAIRMAN GODDARD:

The next order of business handed me is the report of the nominating committee. Is the chairman of the nominating committee present?

SECRETARY TRUEBLOOD:

The chairman of the nominating committee is in Washington. I would ask that Professor Hull read the report.

[Prof. Hull read the report of the nominating committee.]

CHAIRMAN GODDARD:

The report of the committee is before you. The reading of it places it before this meeting. If there are any other nominations for any position it is the privilege of any member of the society to suggest it.

MR. BEALS:

I think, just to make it democratic—I think the same trouble afflicted the nominating committee that afflicted the nominating committee of last year. Their sense of geography is limited to the Hudson river. There are other pacifists besides those of the eastern third of the United States. This dear old war horse Jenkin Lloyd Jones on his annual trip to the Southland ran into the gum shoe, subtle, Big Navy League campaign, and put a man's testimony against that sort of thing. Why should not a man like Jenkin Lloyd Jones be on the list of vice-presidents? Why should not a woman like Mrs. Philip N. Moore be on the list of vice-presidents? And with my unhallowed obstinacy I want to renew the protest which I entered at Washington last year, that our nominating committee take a course in geography. Mr. Mead looks over and smiles. He remembers several years ago in Boston at our annual meeting when the nomination list was read I suggested and moved that the name of Lyman Abbott be dropped from the names of vice-presidents. I was voted down and being a peaceful man I deferred to the judgment of my big elder brother, Dr. Trueblood. I then said that it seemed to me that he was standing for and advocating, through the important organ of which he was the editor, the Outlook, that he was standing for and advocating the other thing in opposition to that which I was dedicating my life. I want to renew that motion here this afternoon. Just a few months ago there was sent all over this country, even to the peace society officers, Dr. Butler and Dr. Trueblood and all the old orthodox peace men, copies of the Navy League petition with the fifty-seven varieties of sophistries—sixty-seven I mean. I answered that having conscientiously and carefully taken the time to read through those alleged reasons I was convinced that I could

not accede to the request of signing the petition, adding my poor name to the list. It was impossible for me to do mental housekeeping with the Navy League petitions and the Peace Society doctrine. Between the two I want to say that I dedicate my little life to the peace enterprise. The letters then went raining in and I think the first name that went over the country and was introduced into Congress was Dr. Abbott's name. Now, I dropped one of the generous members of the Chicago Peace Society and took personal responsibility by returning that man's membership fee and dropped his name from the membership list because his name was on that Navy League petition, on the ground that signing that Navy League petition was public disavowal of the objects of our peace society as set forth in the seventh article of the constitution. I think the issue might just as well be drawn. It is being drawn. The choosing time is coming on apace. It is either one thing or the other—the helping of civilization or the halting of civilization. I think we might just as well stand squarely with those who have the prophet's faith and who are willing to stand with the few. Therefore, Mr. President, I renew my motion of five years ago that Dr. Abbott's name be stricken from the list. Then I would like somebody else to suggest that Jenkin Lloyd Jones' and Mrs. Philip N. Moore's names be added to the list.

CHAIRMAN GODDARD:

It has been moved and seconded that the name of Dr. Lyman Abbott be dropped as one of the vice-presidents in the report of the committee. You had better vote on that and then see how the society stands on it. That is the question before the house at this time, whether or not Dr. Lyman Abbott shall be dropped.

(Thereupon the motion was duly put and carried.)

A DELEGATE:

I move that Hiram Hadley of New Mexico, and President Edwin Stanley of Friends' University, Wichita, Kansas, be added to the list of vice-presidents. I believe those states are not represented.

SECRETARY TRUEBLOOD:

In seconding that motion I would like to say that Mr. Beals was given rather an unfair bit of information in the matter of vice-presidents. There are people from all sections of the country on that list of vice-presidents. It is impossible to have the president from all sections of the country, unless you call Senator Burton from all sections of the country. It is impossible to have the Executive Committee, which has to come out of the Board of Directors, from all parts of the country. We are obliged almost, in the executive work of the society to have enough men near who can be called on for Board of Directors' meetings. Now, there is the provision that every branch society that has one hundred members or more up to six hundred can nominate one member of the Board of Directors, so that all branch societies with a hundred members or so have representative directors. We are fairly widely distributed geographically on this list. I want to say so much in seconding the motion for the election of these two gentlemen as vice-presidents. At the meeting last year and at some of our directors' meetings it has been thought advisable to cut down year after year our long list of vice-presidents, to cut out a number of those who have been on from time immemorial and give us a chance to put on new people. The nominating committee left off eight or nine vice-presidents of last year and have only put in the report, I think, Judge Thomas Burke, of Seattle, Washington.

MR. L. BRADFORD PRINCE, of New Mexico:

I have no right as a member to speak and I am simply asking the privilege on account, I believe, of being the only person present from New Mexico who is a personal friend of Professor Hadley. It is simply on account of my very long acquaintance with Professor Hadley that I desire to say a word as to the eminent professor, to add the voice of one who has known him for over thirty years in New Mexico, who has been acquainted with his educational work there from the very beginning, who was Governor at the time when the public school system of the state was put in active operation and the

higher institutions of learning commenced their career. I know of Professor Hadley as the head of the Agricultural College at one time and the University at another and as the leader always in educational affairs in the whole of the Southwest. I wish to raise my voice and say to those who may not know him personally and have not had that opportunity that there could not possibly be a more suitable and fitting nomination than that which has been made and one which would give this cause a greater impetus through all of the Southwest.

CHAIRMAN GODDARD:

These two gentlemen, of course, go on the list of Honorary Vice-Presidents. This motion does not necessarily elect those two gentlemen because there will finally have to be a motion to elect in some way. The final election must be by ballot in some way.

MR. MEAD:

Responsive to the suggestion of Mr. Beals, I should like to submit, prior to this vote, as additions to the list of vice-presidents Jenkin Lloyd Jones and Mrs. Moore, not only because we honor them so highly for their services to the cause, but because there is a particularly representative reason. Mr. Jones, representing the great City of Chicago where our Congress was held a few years ago has been one of the first and most competent authorities and workers for our cause. Not only is Mrs. Moore eminent in the work in this city but it was under her presidency that our cause was made the cause of the great American Federation of Women's Clubs. (Applause.) I trust we all feel humiliated at the revelation today that our society in all its branches has only about six thousand members. I believe that before the Federation of Women's Clubs has been a supporter of this great movement for two years it will alone add as many members to the American Peace Society and its branches as the societies have today. This is a wonderful acquisition of the organized women of this country. We should elect to our body a vice-president who is at this moment so singular a power in women's work. There is this double reason why we should elect this most

efficient representative of our cause in the city where we are gathered and who has been so active in the Congress. Therefore, it is with great pleasure that I submit these two names also as vice-presidents.

MRS. WILLIAM A. BLODGETT:

I know it has been said that certain people are from one part of the country, but if new names are to be added to this list to be submitted for a vote I should like to suggest the name of a woman who represents nationally a large body of women who are not necessarily in the Federation of Women but who are organized under the standard of the National Congress of Mothers. I would like to submit for this consideration the name of Mrs. Frederick Schoff, of Philadelphia, National President of the Congress of Mothers.

CHAIRMAN GODDARD:

Is there any objection to any one of these five that have been nominated? If not the motion to add will be in order.

[Thereupon the motion to add the five names above nominated was duly put and unanimously carried.]

MR. W. O. HART, of New Orleans:

I have been requested by the Mayor of the City of New Orleans and by the Progressive Union, our leading commercial body, and by other organizations to present the name of New Orleans as the meeting place for 1914. We have no local peace society in Louisiana and that is another reason why the American Peace Society should meet in the metropolis of that state. We have a very distinct peace sentiment. There have been a number of peace meetings in New Orleans. One was addressed a couple of years ago by Mrs. Mead. The Progressive Union has a committee on international arbitration. We have had peace day in the schools since 1907. The great peace celebration of 1915 is one in which New Orleans is very much interested because the culminating event of that celebration, if plans carry as some have outlined, is the building of a great peace monument by Great Britain to the United States on the battlefield of Chalmette not to celebrate the victory of one English-

speaking people over the other but to celebrate the one hundred years of peace between these two greatest nations. And let me say, Mr. Chairman, in connection with the many celebrations which we have been attending in this city this week, that had it not been for the City of New Orleans there would have been no Louisiana Purchase, no great Exposition of 1904, no St. Louis and no monument in Forest Park, because the original idea of Jefferson was not to purchase Louisiana Territory from France, but to purchase what was called "The Isle of Orleans," so that the vessels of Americans from the Ohio and Missouri and other rivers should have free access to the sea. The Isle of Orleans embraced the City of New Orleans, a portion of the state past Lake Ponchartrain and then into the Gulf, making that little piece of territory an island. It was only as the negotiations progressed that Napoleon said, "Why not buy the whole of Louisiana," and the whole of Louisiana was bought. Now, I don't know by whom the meeting place is selected, but at all events I submit the invitation and trust it will be accepted. I believe it will be an education for all who go there as well as an education for all who are there. It is not necessary for me to describe the charms of New Orleans, the old city and the new city, the French and the Spanish portions. If I were to attempt to give the attractions of New Orleans I am afraid I would take the rest of the day. (Applause.)

MR. BEALS:

While we are in a thankful mood I think a motion to thank our officers for the services of the past year would be exceedingly fitting. For the sake of getting through the business I voted to accept the treasurer's report and back of that splendid showing that we all rejoice in, which gives us a margin to fall back on, a margin of strength, is the administration, the wise patient administration of our general secretary. I have just had bound up some old volumes of the Advocate of Peace, and in one of those I found that when Dr. Hart died in Rome, Dr. Trueblood came to the work, and all these years patiently, sometimes through discouragements, wisely, cautiously, and efficiently, the forces have been guided, and I

should like to move a vote of thanks to the officers of the association for their services through the past year.

A DELEGATE:

I most heartily second that motion. I can hardly express in words my appreciation of their kindness and their patience, and the help which I received from them. I am glad such a motion has been offered.

[Thereupon the motion was duly put and carried.]

SIXTH GENERAL SESSION

THE OUTLOOK FOR PEACE THROUGHOUT THE WORLD

Saturday Evening, May 3, at 8 o'clock

THE ODEON

PRESIDENT RICHARD BARTHOLDT, Presiding

PRESIDENT BARTHOLDT:

In calling the last meeting of the Fourth American Peace Congress to order I desire to pay a tribute to those delegates and others, who by their faithful attendance made this Congress the success it has proved to be. A cause supported by the honest convictions and the steadfast loyalty of so many good men and women can not fail. To doubt its success would be to doubt the manifest destiny of the human race. (Applause.) It can not fail because it is right and just. It can not fail any more than the cause of Christianity failed or the cause of the abolition of human slavery failed. In both of those cases it was simply a small band of men with honest convictions in their hearts and their minds, inspired by an honest and just cause. Look about you today. Christianity is the ruling religion of the world and slavery is abolished. (Applause.) As I said the other day, as man selling has been abolished this cause of ours will result in abolishing man killing. (Applause.) But the program tonight is varied and rather crowded and the chairman should not take up any more time than is absolutely necessary to introduce the speakers. Our general subject tonight is, "The Outlook for Peace Throughout the World," and we are fortunate in having with us a gentleman representing one of our neighboring republics to the south, a representative diplomat in Washington who will speak for all of his colleagues who have honored our Congress with their

presence. I take great pleasure in introducing to you Señor Alfonso Frederico Pezet, The Minister of Peru. (Applause.)

[The address in full of Minister Pezet is given elsewhere in this book. It was first delivered at the section meeting on "Inter-American Relations" in the St. Louis University Auditorium Thursday afternoon. It created such an impression that Minister Pezet was requested to repeat it at the general session of the Congress. The subject was "Mutual Confidence and Respect as a Basis for Peace Between Nations."]

PRESIDENT BARTHOLDT:

One of the main characteristics of the peace movement is honesty. If we be honest I am afraid that we shall have to admit that a part of the criticism passed upon us by our distinguished guest is only too well founded. In order to prove that at least those present do not share the attitude of indifference towards our Latin-American neighbors that he has described I ask you, to show our respect for him and all the other diplomats who came here on this occasion, to rise from your seats.

[The audience arose and applauded.]

The next speaker will be Dr. Thomas E. Green, delegate from Illinois who will address you on "The Burden of the Nations," a subject which, if generally understood by the American people would very soon lead to the establishment of peace in this country and in the world. I take pleasure in introducing to you Dr. Green.

The Burden of the Nations

THOMAS EDWARD GREEN.

I am very much inclined to think that kindly disposed as I know you all are, you scarcely appreciate the burden of difficulty that rests upon a speaker who, at the end of three days' of such erudite and eloquent discussions and addresses of those to which you have listened is called upon to stand before you at this closing session, and attempt to offer anything that shall

have about it even the suggestion of novelty. Then again I find myself embarrassed by the fact that I am taking a place upon a program that is to be closed in your hearing by that eminent educator and publicist, honored by the nation and by the world as one of our great authorities along economic and sociological lines. That I attempt, even as a prelude to what he will have to say to you, to offer anything at all, makes me feel a very deep consciousness of superfluosity, to say the least. I find myself very much in the attitude of that somewhat legendary oyster—you possibly may have heard of him—who awakening from soporific unconsciousness found himself in contact with a fellow-oyster. Turning to him rather sleepily, he said: "What is this function, where are we, what are we to do?" And the second oyster said, "Why, don't you know? This is a church festival." "A church festival," said the first oyster. "Well, it looks like one, but if it is a church festival, why are there two of us?" (Laughter and applause.)

I find myself in very much the same predicament of consciousness tonight, but what I shall have to say to you in regard to "The Burden of the Nations" may possibly carry with it a little bit of meaning from the simple fact that I have just returned a few months ago from a two years' journey around the world, a greater part of that time being spent, in so far as I was able, not in mere sight-seeing, but in an attempt to come in contact with and to try to understand existing conditions among the great nations of the world along these lines in which we are all of us interested. That I came into contact with some very interesting men, who were attempting to meet their difficulties, and that I came into personal contact with many conditions as they exist today was my extreme good fortune. If, out of that experience I can bring to you this evening some simple facts, perhaps supplemental to what you have already heard which may form an argument in favor of that cause in which we are all deeply interested, I shall feel that after all, perhaps, I have played my part not in vain.

If money is the measure of economic value, civilization is standing today face to face with its most stupendous problem. Sixty-five per cent of the entire income of the civilized world was lavished during the last year upon a common object, an

object that by common consent stands very low in the scale of moral appraisal. Whatever may have been the glory of the lost arts or the splendor of the famed Atlantis, we love to persuade ourselves these days that our age is at least writing some new chapters in the history of enlightenment. Our age is instinct with attainment. It devises decorations for those who bend the cosmic forces of the Universe anew to the will of man.

It enriches fertile furrows; changes fruit and flowers to rich beauty; and reaps redoubled harvests with the pruning hooks of skilled capacity.

It rids the world of slavery; cleanses the putrid pools of pestilence; rescues humanity from the bondage of pain, disease and death.

It has laid the ghosts of fear and bigotry; eliminated error; boldly challenged ancient sophistry; emancipated thought; flung wide the portals of unfettered research. All this and more, is the motif of the twentieth century. Added to a wise philosophy, joined with fraternal coöperation, it is the dynamic measure of an age of gold. To its furtherance there should be given the best and highest constructive and creative forces of the world. But iconoclasm has possessed the better judgment of the nations. A vampire philosophy is sucking the life blood of lofty purpose. Civilization today lauds and decorates her scholars, but an age unequaled among the centuries in incalculable treasure sends its scholars to search in stunted squalor; chains investigation with insufficiency; progress pines in poverty; earth's largest, loftiest, longings languish in impotent indigence, while civilization pours uncounted millions at the shrine of ravening savagery, and wastes the substance of its people in the murderous enginery of war.

During 1912 the nations spent two billion, two hundred and fifty millions of dollars (\$2,250,000,000) in the creation of military and naval armament.

Since history began to be written, it is estimated that fifteen billion men have died as a result of battle. Such figures are beyond the possibility of our normal conception. Our Savior was born nineteen centuries ago, and from the moment that the new-born child lay in the manger cradle in Bethlehem until now, there have been barely one billion minutes. Fifteen

billion men means all the human beings that have lived in the world for six hundred years, counting three generations to a century.

During the nineteenth century alone, 14,000,000 men died as a result of battle, and it cost the world forty-two thousand million dollars for their taking off. And as the result of all that stupendous price of life and treasure there stands no single great achievement recorded for the common good.

On the ledger pages of history there are no great accomplishments to balance the awful account. It meant for the most part simply a change of masters or some tinkering and gerrymandering with the outlines and the boundaries of adjacent states. The gratification of envy, jealousy and hatred, the bloody enthusiasm of mere physical victory! Of course, the great Civil War in America effected the emancipation of millions of negro slaves, but with the money that that war cost us, the actual outlay, to say nothing of the awful heritage that after nearly fifty years still remains to vex and trouble us, we might have bought, paid for, educated and endowed every slave ten times over. (Applause.)

And yet with the awful experience of history to make us wise the world still insists that war is tenable between civilized nations. Not war, mind you, as an absolute frank, outspoken purpose of destruction. There are few save those who by a perverted policy we have educated and trained in the gentle art of killing, who would justify the world's ancient savagery and find in its bloody cruelty an ideal of courage. To justify itself the age has invented a new delusion. War in its grim reality is the sole survivor of mediæval barbarism. Everything else has been banished. We have eliminated pestilence, we have removed slavery, we have prevented famine. We have driven superstition and ignorance before the advancing light of civilization and culture. War alone of all remains to flaunt its horrid crest in the face of the twentieth century. An age whose loudly lauded ideals are the protection, the development, the evolution of human life can not justify war. For war deliberately plans the ruthless, inhuman destruction of myriads of living men. It makes possible the agony and the nameless suffering incident to torn and mangled bodies. It

inflicts upon the innocent and the defenseless the hideous torment of bereavement, the lasting, gnawing grief of broken-hearted solitude, and the sunless future of dreary, unalleviated poverty and want. It takes from a generation its strongest and most virile and leaves the decadent, anæmic and the unfit to the fatherhood of generations to come. It destroys homes, it despoils widows, it bereaves orphans. It exalts murder into virtue. It halos cruelty with the excellency of courage. It drags down the human brotherhood and fills the world with the foul dissonance of fiends let loose from hell. All this, and indescribably, unspeakably more is war, and so no one justifies war.

There is not a sovereign in the world today that would advocate war. There is not a Parliament or Congress in the world today that would countenance war. There is not a prime minister in the world today that would suggest war. There is not a journal or a review in the whole world but depreciates war. There is not a nation in the world today but trembles at the mention of war. And yet never since the history began to be written has the world wasted so much of the people's substance, never have such enormous expenditures been lavished as the great nations of the earth are flinging into the mad, fatuous race of the militarism of today.

On the one side they tell us war is impossible; that the whole thing is a mad delusion. The great political economist, Jean de Bloch, in that eminent work that has merited the admiration of the civilized world, has proven that the great war, the war that has been haunting the imagination of men for a hundred years, has automatically eliminated itself from the realm of possibility. But for the most part men have realized that all these lavish resources are not for a mere phantasm of purpose. War is still as possible as ever. But men have hidden its awful meaning behind a skillful mask of deception.

We are not fighting war in this Peace Congress, for nobody wants war. We are fighting a delusion. We have invented a new economy that protests with fulsome platitudes its humanitarian purposes. It loathes war, it loves peace, and the only way in which we can make peace certain, the only way in which we can insure life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness

is to be ready at any cost, however enormous, to compel peace even by barbaric force—(applause)—for each individual nation to be so strongly, so invincibly armed as to make all other nations peaceful and affectionate, even if one has to shoot them into obedient tranquillity.

The kindest excuse that we can make for such a philosophy is to say that militarism is a disease, that it is an economic pestilence, life sapping, reason destroying, irrational. Its entire philosophy is a delusion. There is no logic by which it can be justified. Common sense as well as common conscience have eliminated such arguments from the world of individuals; only the logic of barbarism can justify it between nations. But you give a man a gun and his finger tingles with the touch of the treacherous trigger.

Let nations maintain vast armaments, call them readiness for war or guarantees of peace as you like, and the world is simply an armed camp where a spark may kindle a conflagration. Where once the nations matched force against force, intent upon conquest, today the nations match force against force, deceived by a mere trick of words. Armies were once the potent agents by which ambitious nations insured victory. Today they are the equally resistless dynamics by which the nations prevent defeat. Save only in sentimental phrases there has been no change, except that with advanced acquirements, the requirements are greater than ever before.

The rivalry is the same; mad, fatuous and insane. The expenditure is beyond all comprehension, and not war but an insane militarism is throttling the world. It is a disease, reason destroying, insensate, incoherent; a pestilence self-nourished. It respects neither present good nor future evil and today the world's greatest problem is, can civilization save itself? Has it an antiseptic for this cancerous distemper? Is there any end possible save chaos?

To safeguard peace the nations prepare for war. Stupendous armies, magnificent navies, are hailed as the supreme safeguards of civilization. Statecraft juggles with words; clothes itself with pretense; presents to the historic judgment of a century to come the pitiful spectacle of a deluded age that increases its armaments at the expense of two billion dollars a

year only for the purpose of making those armaments useless, an age when nations are willing to confess that they are bankrupting themselves to keep from fighting. (Applause.)

The statesmen of the world stand aghast. They dare not drop behind in the mad race of equipment. They are tormented by the old-time philosophy of the survival of the strongest. On either side lies peril. They appreciate the value of the things that should be done, but can not be done for lack of public ways and means.

They recognize the calamity of an enormous ruinous taxation, crushing the people into helpless penury, gendering insensate discontent, threatening the very foundations of law and order.

They know that the masses of the people, the bone and sinew of the nations' welfare, are not afraid of foes abroad. They are afraid of want and penury, the burden of the struggle of life at home, every year becoming more burdensome and more exhausting. They know that on the same common people they must depend alike for money with which to equip and the men with which to fight. And they know that they are rapidly approaching the point where both are going to be denied. (Applause.)

Behind them is a crazed resistless force, before them yawns the Stygian abyss of destruction.

Let it be understood that in the discussion of such a question as this a radical distinction be observed between the dominant nations of Europe and the United States of America. With them conditions are by force of circumstance and the necessity that grips them is the result of resistless environment. They are the legatees of centuries of struggle, the creatures of hereditary rivalry, jealousy and inborn antipathy.

Out of a unique environment of absolute self-sufficiency, we are still, thank God, the architects of our own fortunes. Our relations, our attitude to the great problems of international economy are still not matters of necessity, but of deliberate choice. What the United States is today, what she shall be tomorrow, is still in the Providence of God what she chooses to be.

It is time then, high time, for the thinking people of the United States to take stock of the great world problems as they exist today, and to determine whether we are to be mere imitators, tagging at the heels of the moth-eaten, suicidal policies of the nations of Europe, entangled already in a hopeless muddle, whose only solution is havoc, or are we to be brave enough to rise to our opportunity and at least point the way to the threshold of a new era, whose accentuating notes shall be a cessation of the ruinous expenditure for military armament, the absolute elimination of war between civilized nations, and the establishment of courts of arbitration for the settlement of all international disputes. (Applause.)

Aside from the humanitarian arguments everywhere admitted, even if everywhere violated, there stands the tremendous logic of facts. Militarism is the burden of the nations. It is exhausting their substance, impoverishing their people, retarding their progress as no war ever did or ever could do. It is crushing the poorer of the nations, it is crippling the richest of them all.

Along a score of lines they are neglecting the welfare of their people that every available dollar may swell the fund for national defense. Take the nations of the world as I saw them and tried to study them during this recent trip around the globe. Begin, if you please with Great Britain, the mother country to which we have always looked as the inspiration for the highest and the best in our Anglo-Saxon life; the source of our art, architecture and literature and law—the very cradle of modern civilization.

Great Britain has forty-five million people, crowded into an area a little larger than our single state of Colorado. That crowded condition has given rise to some strange and remarkable economic facts. In the first place, Great Britain has a public debt of more than three and a half billion dollars, an average of \$92 per capita for every man, woman and child in the country. Last year, by census count, there were in England 1,086,707 paupers. That is something you don't know anything about in this country. Outside of the eleemosynary institutions where we put those who by some limitation are

unable to take care of themselves, we don't have that type of population in America.

Go on Monday to your public schools and stand before a class in the eighth grade and begin to talk to them about paupers. They would open their eyes wide in ignorance and wonder as to what you meant. A pauper is a man or woman who has nothing, who can get nothing, who depends for every mouthful of food and strip of clothing upon public or private charity.

In England tonight there are 1,086,707 absolute paupers. Mr. Lloyd George, has stated that under the old age pension bill it had been discovered that there are in Great Britain 12,000,000 people actually entitled under the terms of the act to public charity, to enable them to end their lives decently, to die comfortably and be buried respectably. Twelve million people so poor that they need public aid to get out of the world in a respectable fashion. And yet with her army of 735,000 men, with her navy of 633 war vessels of all sorts and kinds, Great Britain is spending this year thirty-five per cent of her entire income, above the interest on her stupendous debt, in creating and maintaining her naval and military armament.

Take Germany. There are 65,000,000 people in Germany, so congested that they average three hundred and ten (310) to the square mile the empire over. You can scarcely conceive of such congestion, and that, too, has created strange and unnatural economic problems.

Germany has a debt of three and a half billion dollars gold, every cent of it war debt. Upon the backs of her people rests an enormous rate of taxation, a taxation that restricts her progress, for she spends over forty-five per cent of her entire income in order that she may maintain her standing army of 1,763,000 soldiers, and build and keep in working order a navy commensurate with that of her great arch-enemy across the channel.

France, ever mindful of her lost provinces, still decorating with pathetic mourning the little kiosk in the Place de Concorde, that bears the name of Strasborg; France, impoverished still by the millions of her men, strong in their manhood, who went to death following the Corsican; France carries a war

debt of over six billion dollars and spends thirty-seven per cent of her entire income in preparation for war.

Russia—I don't think I ever visited a country in all my travel up and down the length and breadth of the world with so much anticipation as I went to Russia. I never came away from any place in this world with so sad a heart. Russia is a wonderfully beautiful country, attractive in its physical endowment. I think St. Petersburg and Moscow are two of the most beautiful cities I ever saw. Nowhere have I seen such evidence of lavish bestowals of wealth upon certain things. I never have stepped inside the arched doorways of such churches; altars gleaming with gold, the holy ikons framed in blazing diamonds and precious stones. They are paved with marble, wainscoted with malachite, paneled with lapis lazuli; and yet step out of that environment of magnificence, and on the porches and on the steps of this majestic church you look upon the most awful squalor and pitiful poverty you ever saw. Old men and women lying there literally rotting, mumbling through toothless gums a prayer for a few pennies to keep them from starvation. I never saw such drunkenness. The Government makes and sells the whiskey—vodka, and the more vodka the peasants drink, the more profit in the pocket of the government. And what does the government care for a few thousand of these mujiks.

Russia covers one-seventh of the land surface of the globe. Out of her stupendous population of millions, seventy-two per cent can neither read nor write, and in the sense that we know it, there is not a public school in the whole empire. And yet Russia carries a crushing debt of four and three-quarter billion dollars. She borrows money every spring to pay the interest on it and yet she has provided this year four hundred and ninety-seven million dollars as a military budget; and at the knout's end she is taking by increased taxation from her peasant and poor people the money with which to build and equip a navy to replace the one that Togo sent to the bottom of the Sea of Japan.

Well, there is Japan. Poor little bankrupt Japan. The logical end of the whole grotesque delusion. Fifty million of industrious, economical, patriotic people wresting a living

from a soil impoverished by centuries, without national resource, figuring income and expense to the last penny; halving each pitiful coin in willingly borne taxation—eighty-five per cent of Japan's income is derived from taxation—she has nothing else. It means that her people must give each year an average of twenty-five per cent of all they have and earn to pay Japan's penalty for following her "Great Ally" in the race of mad militarism.

Only fifteen per cent of the land of Japan is arable and that only under forced intensive farming; all the rest of it is waste sand, rock and lava, which would not grow even a blade of grass, and even the fifteen per cent of arable soil must be artificially fertilized before it will bring forth anything at all.

Japan has a national debt of \$1,378,000,000, an average of \$21.75 for every man, woman and child in the whole empire. If you put Japan upon the auction block tomorrow and sell her before the nations of the world, everything from one end of the empire to the other, the jewels of the emperor's crown, her manufactories, railroads, tea fields, everything—I question whether at public sale the whole empire would bring enough to discharge the stupendous crushing debt that she has laid upon her shoulders in an endeavor to keep up with her great "Ally of the West."

And as we have had a great deal said just now about Japan perhaps here is the place where I may add my single word. I have been in Japan a great deal for the last ten years. Some of my best, warmest and most trusted friends are men who stand high in the councils of the empire and who are striving with all the intensity of their intense natures to solve their problems. I spent a very pleasant day not long ago with Count Okuma, one of the few remaining old men of the ancient regime. Far from being the firebreathing, sanguinary monster that a great deal of our sensational description pictures, as describing the leading men of Japan, he is a delightful old man, spending the twilight of his life in good deeds. He has endowed a magnificent university where some three thousand young men and women are engaged in the laudable pursuit of getting an education. He has one of the most magnificent collections of orchids in the world. He specializes in beautiful

first editions. He is a philosopher and a sage. An ideal old man. He said to me as we were talking about these things: "The impression has gone out through the world that the Japanese are a sanguinary nation, that we are bloodthirsty and quarrelsome and that we delight in warfare. Have you ever stopped to think that Japan has fought just two wars in all her history and that both those wars were in defense of what she considered, as you in America have considered when you have fought, her sacred rights and her national honor. What Japan needs and must have is not war. She has had enough of that, heaven knows. She needs fifty years of quiet, constructive peace to win back the comfortable prosperity to which men may look as an ideal of national existence."

I am sure that Count Okuma simply voiced a sentiment of multitudes of men whose names I might call and with whom I have talked in his expression of hearty gratitude to the United States. He said, "You opened the door for us by which we came out into the sisterhood of civilized nations. It was you who led the way. Shall a child make war upon its revered mother?" And that is the sentiment you will find in Japan. (Applause.)

Don't believe, my friends, the things that come filtering through in the yellow dispatches from Tokio, designed merely to make reading matter for sensational scare lines. (Applause.)

Yellow journalism depends upon springing sensations, even at the expense of kindling between nations the awful catastrophe of war. Japan is not going to fight you, not because she has only nineteen battleships, where you have thirty-three. Japan is not going to fight you, because she does not want to fight anybody. She wants to be let alone. She wants peace—constructive peace. She is not going to fight you, because she likes you. She is not going to fight anyone, because she can't.

She went back from Portsmouth defeated, in her demand for indemnity, not by the diplomacy and the strategy of Witte, but defeated by her own empty-handed poverty, for she knew, as the Russians knew, that Japan could not have delivered another battle to save her soul. There is only one way Japan could fight you, and that is that some Occidental nation, intent

upon her suicide, should underwrite the method of her self-murder, or that the Hebrew bankers of Europe should take a mortgage on her tea fields and lacquer factories, feeling certain of its enforcement.

Japan is not going to fight you as long as you and I are true to the principles upon which America stands. Japan will look to you as her inspiration and her friend. (Applause.)

But there is not a nation of the world, from the least to the greatest, but has a hundred causes of paramount importance to the future of her people why these wasted millions might well be devoted to some other service. No matter what is left undone, the military mania is ever crying with feverish greed for more. Side by side with neglect of national duty and the squandering of national resources militarism is breeding internal dangers. The civilized world is seething with discontent.

Everywhere the mass of the people are developing a resentful opposition to the existing order of things, and by far the greater part of it comes from the crushing weight of taxation made necessary by the continually and constantly increasing demand for larger sums to devote to national defense. To the masses of men taxation is only justifiable when its results are manifested in the general good. It is hard to convince men of the necessity in times of peace of vast creations of armament, when in order to pay for it there must result ruinous taxes, long hours, short wages, high prices. The burden eventually becomes too heavy to be borne, and then comes chaos.

In England today, with an annual income of one billion dollars, eighty-six per cent comes from almost ruinous taxation. In Germany, in addition to the government ownership, the taxation burdens all classes of the people. In France the interest on the national debt alone is five dollars a head for every living soul in the Republic, and the war budget takes \$7.20 more per capita. In Italy taxes range from twelve per cent on houses, to twenty per cent on income. In Japan ninety per cent of the income is from taxation—and Japanese patriotism rises to a willing rate of thirty-five per cent—but he pays it with a smile on his face and a song in his heart, and Banzai for the glory of Japan. (Applause.)

Far beyond the decadent effect of actual war is the immoral effect of vast bodies of segregated men. Murder, cruelty, rapine and loot always follow in the trail of battle, but they come quickly and they pass quickly. But far more lasting and degrading are the vices that hang about the idle thousands of armed peace.

In Germany today fifty-seven per cent of the men are unmarried. There are three reasons for that peculiar condition of things. The first is that the average population is 310 to the square mile. It takes a brave man, conscious of his power of parenthood, to complacently look into the face of the possibility of increasing that per cent of population. Then every man in Germany under the age of forty can be called on three days' notice to the colors. And when he is called he must go. He may dislike the order of things, he may dislike the war lord, but when he is called he must go, put on his uniform and stand up and make a target of himself to be shot at, whether he will or not, and no man wants a wife with a cottage and a little brood of children with a contingency like that before him. Then a great many of the men in Germany do not need to be married. Let me tell you just one single fact, a little bit of bar sinister, not worse in Germany I take it than any other country, but I happen to have the statistics for this. Last year ten per cent of all the children born in Germany were fatherless so far as recognized wedlock was concerned. There were born in Germany 172,814 illegitimate children. The very large majority, said the census report, in the neighborhood of cities housing large garrisons of troops. I could give you other facts of that same sinister import, but I forbear.

A friend of mine, who is a major-surgeon in the English army, walked with me through a great military hospital. There were twelve hundred men from garrisons scattered all over Great Britain. My friend told me that out of the standing army of 725,000 men over 100,000 were hopelessly, helplessly, incurably invalided as the result of the vices that hang around the camp, that inhere in the profession of the soldier.

Don't you see that if you teach a man that one commandment is wrong, you can't for the life of you defend the other

nine? Don't you see that if it is right to commit murder, you have no logic by which you can teach him that it is wrong to commit adultery. Don't you see that the whole moral fabric stands or falls by the same logic? (Applause.)

The underlying genius of warfare is strategy, and in the conception of strategy, the end always justifies the means. Deceit, fraud, untruthfulness, spite, betrayal, these are the methods, of military statesmanship. Embody them in modern civilization and you have found war's philosophy.

Aside from Japan, an anomaly among her sister nations, the great powers of the world are all the representative embodiment of Christian civilization. Cut out all reference to the spiritual side of religion, all reference to salvation, or heaven, or hell, or immortality; make Christianity merely the dynamic of a desirable type of civilization. Reduce the much disputed question of foreign missions to a mere desire to carry culture about the world.

What sort of a front does the Christian civilization of the world present as it prays its prayers and sings the psalms under the shadow of naked steel, while the "perishing heathen" laugh in ill-concealed contempt and cry, "Look how these Christians love!"

I think the saddest thing I saw in my whole journey around the world was a cartoon in a Mohammedan paper published in Cairo. I happened to be in that part of the world, when Italy declared war against Turkey to take Tripoli. The most inexcusable act that has happened in modern civilization was the declaration of war against Turkey for a little strip of arid land in Tripoli. Italy had no reason to fight, unless it was that she said—"We have a big army. We have trained them to kill. Unless we give them something to kill, they might get to killing each other. We have got to have something to keep our battleships from rusting away at the docks. All the nations have taken a bit of Africa. England took a grab, France took a piece, Germany reached over and took a little; if we are going to train in big company we must have a piece of Africa." So Italy declared war. (Applause.) I happened to be in Italy when the legions marched away from their homes in Florence, in Rome, in Naples. These regiments

of boys came down the streets and took ships that took them to Africa, they knew not what for; they cared less. I never saw a particle of enthusiasm in those regiments. They looked to me very much like our regiments of national guards. Boys, mostly; broad shoulders, brown cheeks, healthy looking. No bands played, the merchants did not leave their stores. The populace did not gather in cheering crowds. I saw no enthusiasm of any kind. They took ship and went to fight for a piece of Tripoli.

A few weeks after that I was in Cairo. A battle had been fought. I saw a cartoon I shall never forget. The Moslem artist had drawn a remarkable picture. It was the desert of Tripoli; in the immediate foreground a single towering palm tree. Under it an old man was standing, an old desert sheik, his tattered burnous scarcely reaching to his poor ankles, his green turban on his head, and the wind blowing his grey locks about his face. Beside him was a little weazened old woman, crouching at his side as he flung around her a protecting arm. Just over here was a younger woman with a babe suckling at her naked breast, another little child pulling at her skirts. All of them seemed to be shrinking from some approaching terror. 'Way yonder on the line of the horizon some one had fired a shell, which had described its fiery arch in the sky. It had suddenly burst above them where it looked like some great meteor falling from the sky, and underneath it the Mohammedan cartoonist had written, "Is this then, perhaps, the Star of Bethlehem?"

Oh, the awful cynicism of it, when we remember that the nation that fired the shot that killed helpless old women and drabbled little children in their own blood was the nation in whose capital city sits the head of the greatest religious organization in the world, "The Vice-Regent of God, to rule in His name." How can Christianity but stand abashed in the presence of this militarism, that gives the lie to its Prince of Peace.

So civilization today faces its most tremendous problem. Morals, education, progress and religion are bound up in one. Militarism squanders resources, increases taxation, raises the cost of living, breeds rebellion and anarchy, lowers moral ideals, spread leprous vice, makes of religion a thing of

grotesque hypocrisy, paralyses missions, throttles the world. Reason cries "Halt!" But fear has reason chained. Not a nation of them all but would stop today if it could, but self-preservation is the first law of life. In the aggregation of ancient states heredity is stronger than sagacity. The world is tricked by a delusion.

Armed peace is not peace, but potential, menacing war. There is only one way to insure peace and that is to abandon the possibility of war. The world wants peace. It wants a constructive age that will prove humanity and make our dreams come true. Who will lead the way? It will require courage and self-sacrifice far beyond the heroism of battle. Who is to lead the way? America can do it. (Applause.)

Is she brave enough? Can she do it still? Has she gone too far, or can she still be what our fathers dreamed when they planted that flag, a new constellation in the firmament of the earth? We have made some sad mistakes. The contagion with its glamour and its barbaric fascination has touched our sober judgment. We who are supreme in our self-sufficiency, have for a century laughed at the follies of old world madness, have allowed ourselves a venture in the domain of Bedlam. Providence flung us for a moment into the forefront of the world, and instead of remembering that we stood for a new age and a new philosophy, we dressed ourselves in the uniform of modern savagery and began to ape the insanity of the older world. We are not by instinct a military nation. It does not set well with the genius of our Republic. It does not attract our men. Our young men are men of vision, of accomplishment; men of peaceful conditions. They dream dreams. There is nothing attractive to the young men of America in being shut up in dusty barracks and burning up in practice marches. If they want to march, they want to march for something and to some place. Our old men are not taken with the posturing of pomposity and the glare and glammers of European militarism. (Applause.)

Our American women don't go down into the dark valley and the shadow of death to breed boys to be made targets for bullets unless there is something behind the bullets that is worth sacrifice. (Applause.) What we have done we have

done well. Let us hug ourselves and say that. (Laughter.) With our tremendous resources, what we have made is the best that can be made.

At Spithead, at the King's Coronation, peace advocate as I am, I hugged myself when I looked upon the lordly Delaware, supremest of them all and proof to the world of what money and Yankee genius can do, when it sets out to do it. But we don't want Delawares, we don't want standing armies and big navies. We have no hereditary enemies. We have no old feuds to fight over. Our militarism is artificial, but its tremendous cost is a proof of how easily we might come to the brink of ruin.

We have only succeeded in collecting an army of 91,785 men, a navy of 47,500; less than 150,000 men in all, even after offering chromos for their enlistment.

We have a population of 100,000,000 on a self-sufficient area of 3,571,223 square miles. What a wonderful thing it is to stand across the seas and look at America! You think about America sometimes, but did you ever look at it at the angle of five thousand miles and see what it looks like? Did you know that you can take England, Ireland, Scotland, Wales, France, Spain, Portugal, Germany, Holland, Belgium, Denmark, Norway, Sweden, Switzerland, Italy, Austria, Greece, Turkey—that is all of Europe except Russia; now take a map of the United States; cut off New England and straighten the eastern line; split the map down the summit of the Rocky Mountains from Canada to Mexico. You have a square republic now, bounded on the north by Canada and the Great Lakes, on the east by the Hudson River and the Atlantic, south by Mexico and the Gulf, west by the Rocky Mountains. Now, between the Hudson River and the Rockies—between Albany, N. Y., and Denver, Col.—you can take all Europe, except Russia, and lay it down once, twice, and a half times—two and a half times—and still have one-sixth of our territory left to make a frame to go around the marvelous picture and hang it on the Pole Star for all the world to view in wonder and amaze. Here are 1,800,000 square miles of arable soil, capable of supporting, not our present 100,000,000, but

capable of supporting a thousand million population, better than any equal area on the face of the earth.

It is marvelous; this supreme America of ours. We have a national debt of a round billion dollars, every penny of it war debt, too. During the past thirty years our population has increased eighty-five per cent, our wealth one hundred and eighty-five per cent and our expenditures four hundred per cent. For the ten years before the Spanish War, we appropriated yearly \$24,000,000 for our army and \$27,000,000 for our navy. Since the Spanish War each year, \$83,000,000 at least has gone to the War Department, an average of \$108,000,000 to the navy. In the ten years we have spent \$1,975,000,000, enough to have paid the entire national debt and have built three Panama Canals.

During 1912, our entire income was \$702,000,000. Of this we expended \$654,000,000, and of that expenditure \$444,000,000 went to war, navy and pension departments. Seventy-two per cent, that is, of the entire income of war, past, present and to come; and twenty-eight per cent, or what was left, for all a great nation should do—deserts to be irrigated, swamps to be drained, rivers to be deepened, harbors to be dredged, forests to be guarded, tuberculosis to be fought, cancer to be investigated, ten million negroes to be cared for—all, all, the mighty problems of a free Republic to be met, and we kept twenty-eight per cent of our income, and gave the rest to a cheap imitation of European insanity.

The whole public school system of America cost in 1912 the sum of \$426,250,434, and we lavished \$444,000,000 on our pet delusion.

A single battleship costs at least \$10,000,000. Its upkeep at least \$750,000 a year. Our big guns cost \$75,000 apiece. Every time a gun is fired it burns \$1,000 to ashes, and all this while people starve in our slums, children die like flies for lack of pure milk and half famished girls sell their virtue for the price of life.

And all this without an enemy in all the world—without a single power to challenge us to combat. (Applause.)

Let America stop. We have nothing to lose. We have an imperishable immortality to gain. More, we can teach our

own people a higher, loftier purpose of life than the sordid greed for territory and power that dominates the policy of the world. We can pour out our millions for the people's good. We can fight poverty and want. We can campaign against vice and unrighteousness. We can make of our armies conquering battalions, who shall bear the triumphant banners of accomplishment. We can bridge our rivers, scale our mountains, make ample our harbors, bring the crystal magic of our streams beneath whose touch our arid deserts shall bud and blossom into gardens of beauty and fertility. We can harness our water falls until the whirl of masterful machinery shall make a symphony, keyed to the music of peace. Never came a victorious army home from carnage and bloody strife, crowned with such glory as belonged to the mud-daubed, water-stained regiments of our National Guard, who a month ago fought the floods, and gave battle to the swollen rivers. Their hands were blistered from the shovel handles, and their shoulders were aching from the burden of bags of sand, but they left behind them not hospitals redolent of gore, or trampled fields laid out in windrows of mangled dead, but mothers clasping to thankful hearts the children rescued from the torrent, and happy towns, rejoicing even in the face of grim destruction, over the valor of a nation's men who had fought for a nation's weal. (Applause.)

We have nothing to lose, save the sorry, sordid boast of cruelty and power. We can gain the realization of a true Democracy, a nation battling for the common good.

Let America stop!

Let America stand before the nations, clad in simple honesty, panoplied in elemental justice. Let her appeal to the common conscience of the world. Let her say to the war-mad, demented powers of Europe, "There is a way out, and we will lead. We will help you police the sea, we will give our quota to a constabulary of peace, but we are through. No great standing army, no more leviathan battleships. We trust to what we boast of as the highest attainment of the age, the innate justice of civilized humanity.

"Touch us if you dare! Violate at your peril the sacred ægis with which we panoply the world's peace!

"We shall have our problems, but for their solution you will go with us to The Hague, you will stand beside us at the bar of International Arbitration, and you will abide by the decision of that court, or we shall hold you up to the scorn and contempt of the enlightened conscience of the world."

Within thirty days of such a pronouncement, the nations of the earth will stand behind America, thanking God for the moral courage of a people who had dared not to fight for peace, but to live to make peace.

It is America's supreme opportunity. It will demand of us clean hands and a pure heart. They must be without reproach who bear the banner of righteousness.

Heaven grant us the courage to be what our fathers dreamed, and when the day shall come, as come it must, when in company with earth's mighty past, this great Republic shall lie down at last, its duty done, its mission ended, may they write above her resting place, not, "This was the greatest nation in the world," not, "This was the richest nation in the world," but, above her may they write in letters of light, that all the ages to come may read and glorify, the proudest epitaph a nation may win. "This—This was America, the Peacemaker of the World."

[At the conclusion of Dr. Green's address the entire audience arose spontaneously and gave the speaker the Chautauqua salute, accompanied by prolonged applause. Sessions of the Congress throughout had been marked by keen interest and much spirit. The enthusiasm reached highest pitch with this masterly presentation.]

MR. ITTNER:

I wish to move a rising vote of thanks to the last speaker.
[The motion was seconded by many delegates.]

PRESIDENT BARTHOLDT:

Mr. Anthony Ittner of St. Louis moves a rising vote of thanks. All in favor of that motion may arise.

[The entire audience again arose amid great cheering.]

PRESIDENT BARTHOLDT:

The speaker has exceeded by one hundred per cent his time limit. The Chairman did not call him down because the Chair knew that the audience wanted to hear the distinguished speaker as much as he did. (Applause.) In fact, I could have listened to him all night. (Applause.) The next speaker is Mrs. Percy V. Pennybacker, President General Federation of Women's Clubs.

Peace Pageants

MRS. PERCY V. PENNYBACKER.

Each one of us is conscious that in the most depraved, as well as in the most commonplace of mankind, there exists at least a spark of divinity. To fan this spark into a burning flame is the greatest service we can render humanity. Since the first law of modern divinity is love, and since the first law of love is peace, by nurturing this flame, we shall also be apostles of Peace.

I have the honor on this occasion to represent the general Federation of Women's Clubs, composed of a million of the representative home-makers of America. A year ago, on the recommendation of the beloved and honored President, Mrs. Philip N. Moore, the Department of Peace was created by this organization. With the sanity and wise forethought that characterize her very act, Mrs. Moore advised that this Peace Committee be made a sub-division of the Educational Department, stating that "the mere love of peace and hatred of war avail little to accomplish results. There should be in some educational form a knowledge of conditions and expense induced by war, a study of international relations, and when war might be necessary, if ever. The subject should be treated in an eminently practical manner, and should react upon intelligent public sentiment."

We are, therefore, now studying all phases of the Peace movement; but while we lay stress on the mental side, we by no means neglect the emotional development.

One of the problems presented is how we may keep within ourselves and arouse in others the passion for peace

and the high resolve of spirit that come in our exalted moments. In proportion as this is accomplished we feel the outlook for Peace grows brighter.

I shall not trespass on your patience this evening by dwelling on the various means to attain this end, but I must mention contact with those who live on the mountain tops and whose feet yet tread our paved streets, and whose hands perform faithfully each humdrum daily task. Such men and women appeal always to our better nature. We may enter their presence sordid and material, but we leave with heads uncovered before our own majesty. What a blessing such people are to the world no one can measure.

Since true art is a "mirror held up to life," the contemplating of great pictures has upon many the same influence that has the personal touch. You have heard the story of the only son of a family dwelling far inland who suddenly announced his determination to adopt a sea-faring life. In vain the father and mother pleaded the boy was inexorable. Finally the faithful pastor was sent for and asked to use his influence to dissuade the lad from such a step. The minister asked: "Can you explain to me, my boy, what has put this thought into your mind? You come of a long line of ancestors whose careers have led in other directions." The boy answered: "Will you come with me upstairs to my bedroom?" Throwing open the door, with an eloquent gesture, he pointed to a picture of a beautiful ship at full sail, speeding o'er the bounding billows. "Ever since I can remember, sir, this picture has greeted me on awakening. I have dreamed of it by night, I have thought of it by day, and somehow it has taken such full possession of my very being that I am convinced there is no happiness for me unless I follow the sea. If my father and mother were so opposed to my being a sailor, why did they place this picture in my room? Why did they set before me such a temptation?"

There are some pictures that are educative by teaching us what to avoid. I knew a German boy who, when the subject of war was discussed, would turn deathly pale and become physically ill. Investigation proved that his governess had taken him more than once to the Pinakotek where he had lin-

gered long before Stüeck's awful picture of war. As I was thinking on this point last Wednesday on the train coming from Virginia, I picked up a St. Louis paper to find as a frontispiece "The Price of War," and to read with interest the comments thereon. Possibly no argument could be stronger for peace than the scattering of such pictures broadcast. Stüeck's canvas is to me the more horrible, because it is the more personal.

The point of my talk this evening is the value of pageants as educative factors in the cause of Peace. From the beginning of history, pageants have exercised a fascination for all ages and all conditions. I have often wondered if we Americans in general, and we advocates of peace in particular, have not undervalued the influence of forms and ceremonies.

As I viewed in Washington on the 4th of March, the Inaugural Parade, as I witnessed battalion after battalion marching down Pennsylvania Avenue, as I saw the glittering array of soldier and seaman, I could but ask myself, "Is this the installation of a civic magistrate, or is it not rather the return from battlefield of some triumphal hero?" Comments made by boys and girls sitting near showed that the great parade impressed them with one idea, the power, the glory, the glitter, the majesty of militarism. As I closed my eyes, I saw another procession which might be far more fitting to the installation of our President, who, while he is made Commander-in-Chief of our Armies by the Constitution, is, however, if our hopes be fulfilled, to exercise only civil powers. As we have taught our children that no man can develop to his highest efficiency without proper cultivation of the moral, mental and physical powers, so would I see in this Inaugural Parade an exemplification of the moral, mental and physical powers of our nation. First should march those great alchemists who from the soil, with nature's magic aid, create the golden corn, the fleecy cotton, upon which the prosperity of the world rests. Next should come the battalions of mechanics, who with their skill make life in our great cities possible, tunnel rivers, span mountains, cover the continent with their network of transportation, and work other miracles. Then should march the Trades Unions as proud of their rank

and efficiency as were the Guilds in days of old, and after them the merchant princes, whose imagination is second to no artist. Who could conceive of a great emporium such as Marshall Field created unless he were gifted with the fancy of a poet, and the vision of a painter? There should follow a great array of artists, of students, and of those who serve in all capacities. I would not ask that the military be omitted, but simply that it should occupy only its own place in this great pageant that sets forth the resources of our country. As the makers of thrift, comfort, happiness pass by with their banners, showing that these peaceful vocations create and not destroy, we might clearly point out to our children that "Peace hath its victories not less renowned than War?" As the President reviews such a procession he might well feel this "day of dedication" is shared by men on whom the success of our Republic really rests. Would not such a conviction give courage to the great man assuming the heaviest burdens within the gift of the American people?

Perhaps there is no greater travesty on a national holiday than our present method of celebrating July 4th; yet no day is so well fitted to be set aside for the special cultivation of Peace and of civic patriotism, no day so well fitted for the holding of elections. I am no prophet, no seer of visions, yet in my day dreams there has come a picture of what some day, God grant, may happen on July 4th in this beautiful city that marks such a happy blending of commercial and intellectual life, and in every community in our country. At an early hour, while the freshness of the summer morn is still felt, the town is all astir and ready for a gladsome holiday. The school buildings are opened, the children come by hundreds laden with flowers. At the sound of martial music a great procession is formed; there are boys and girls, young maidens dressed in white and crowned with garlands, gracious matrons, the poor mother about whose skirts many little children cling, the man of affairs, and the man who toils with his hands. The procession sweeps on till the temple of justice is reached. At a signal the ranks open. Who be the stalwart youths, broad of shoulder, clear of eye, that march down the open center? Are they the guests of honor? Aye, indeed, they are the city's

guests of honor; but they are even more. They are her most precious possessions, her sureties for the future. These are the young men of St. Louis and the surrounding country, who, during the past twelve months, have passed their twenty-first birthday, and at this election will cast their first ballots; this day is set aside to honor them, to celebrate their donning the toga. As they pass, the children strew their path with flowers; the maidens cast garlands at their feet; each mother with a smile on the lip but a tear in the eye murmurs, "God bless you, my boy;" men of low and high degree, side by side, stand with uncovered heads. Into the house of justice sweeps the great multitude; the young citizens are escorted to seats of honor marked by our country's colors and guarded by our country's flag. Then rises a great orator, the best that love and money can obtain, for nothing is too good for this day and for these guests. As he speaks, not of military honors and martial glory, but of the great Peace heroes of our land, as he illustrates from the pages of history the results that come from an unselfish devotion to home, State and country, as he holds up the high ideals of true American citizenship, watch their flashing eyes and inspired faces. Ah, dear friends, they will respond to every noble thought, for who are these youths but our little boys grown tall? As at our knees, in the years gone by, they listened eagerly to the tales of courage, the tears and smiles coming quickly, so now they feel just as deeply and are just as easily touched, though custom bids them conceal emotion.

When the speaker is silent, amid a solemn hush, the magistrate of the city, county or state, reads aloud the names of the new citizens and administers to them the civic oath, in which oath Peace shall play a part.

Think you not such a day would be an inspiration to the whole community? If we genuinely placed such honor, such importance, upon Peace and the entrance into civic life it would not be long before we should see the result. It would be no idle dream to believe that the day would come when the young man on the eve of casting his first vote would feel as did the squire of old on the eve of knighthood; and if he spend the night in fasting and prayer, so much the better. When he

holds in his hand for the first time that bit of white paper, the badge of his citizenship, he may well say: "This and this only is my sword, and I shall blush to cast it for an unworthy cause or an ignoble purpose; even as Sir Galahad would have scorned to draw his matchless blade in a dishonorable quarrel."

When this halcyon day comes, dear friends, a new era will dawn. The Muse of History shall call for a golden pen and she shall write still higher on the roll of Fame and the roll of Peace not the North, nor the South, nor the East, nor the West, but the one word that means all of these, the name we love so well—"America."

PRESIDENT BARTHOLDT:

In your name I thank Mrs. Pennybacker for her splendid address. At the end of Dr. Green's splendid address a gentleman in the audience desired to move that all Missourians present should join the Missouri Peace Society. In order to give the audience an opportunity to approve the sentiments of the speakers tonight in such a manner the chair entertains the motion. I wish to say that membership blanks have been distributed and can be had at the door. All in favor of joining the Missouri Peace Society will rise. There is no obligation attached.

[The audience arose.]

The next address will be by a gentleman who is known the world over as a militant pacifist, an eloquent champion of the cause of peace. He will speak on the subject, "Appreciation of the Waste of War." I have the honor of presenting to you President David Starr Jordan, of Leland Stanford, Jr., University, of California. (Great applause.)

Appreciation of the Waste of War

DAVID STARR JORDAN.

I have first the duty of presenting the compliments of Mr. Bryan (applause), whose closing speech to the Peace Congress could not be given by him. That is not exactly the way he put it; he could not be here to greet you. He is engaged

in the practical work of peace-making. Whether he has any great influence with the great Progressive majority of the great Progressive state or not does not make any difference because he has the real victory. He has shown the people of this country and the people of Japan that this Government is alive to the interest of its wards, and the aliens in this country are wards of the nation having their rights, whatever they may be, through the nation dealing with them. The great question is not so much whether injustice is done or will be done but the question whether a state can usurp any of the rights of the United States in dealing with a foreign nation and whether in passing this extremely ingenious bill that comes up pretty soon in California, California is actually usurping the rights of the United States. I believe that she is, but then California always was a forward state, leads in everything—(laughter) and is moving westward just as was suggested tonight and it is well that she should. The people in Japan like to say that “the ocean does not separate us from California, it joins us to California.” Down in California, we in California are to be neighbors of Japan for the next thousand years. And it is good to be good neighbors. The moral that I get out of all this is what I once heard Theodore Roosevelt say: “It always pays for a nation to be a gentleman.” (Applause.) That is what the peace movement means. It is the movement toward making “gentlemen” and not “gunmen” out of the civilized nations. (Applause.)

I shall speak tonight on War and Waste, and the best things I could say have, unfortunately, been better said in this most eloquent discourse that we heard just now. Mr. Green has traveled around the world to good purpose. He has kept his eyes open; he has seen the truth; he has seen that this nation is the one great nation that is not on the very verge of the abyss; he has seen that this nation is the one nation that has the power to turn back from that abyss and sooner or later to bring the others with it. A good friend of mine of France once said, “If we are to look for great nations in Europe we must look for them among the nations that are counted little, among the nations like Denmark, Switzerland, Norway, Sweden and Holland.” They have governments

maintained in the interest of the people, in the interest of the people today and not in the interest of the mediæval traditions of things that have gone by, that can never come out of the great superstition that has hung over this century and centuries that have gone before, a superstition that there is something noble, something that is glorious, something that is strengthening, something that is useful and something that is honorable in war. It is true that war has at times swept away a great deal of evil with the good it has swept away. This was summed up by a Confederate officer with whom I was talking in Virginia on the battlefield of the Wilderness. He said, "We are glad the Union is restored and that slavery is gone; we are glad that the old aristocracy is passed away; we are glad for what has since brought possibilities to the children of all our people, but for war as war there is not one single word to be said."

War and Waste—every dollar that is spent by the Government that could have been saved just as well is waste. Every dollar that is spent uselessly is in some part, in some degree, a corrupt dollar. One of the great evils of our society is the fact that so much of our money goes for corruption in one way and another. Every dollar that is spent needlessly in maintaining an armed peace is money that is spent in such a way as to corrupt. It is in part graft. We have seen in Europe, in this little Balkan War, a great firm that is making armament in Germany distributing dividends amounting, it is said, to some \$30,000,000—that is amounting to some thirty per cent of its capital stock, as the proceeds of that war. And we have seen that armament firm, if we can trust the accounts given, putting the newspapers of Paris to writing abusive articles on Germany in order to show the Germans how bitter the French are, so that there will be more and more armaments made; so that more and more that great cancer at Essen will grow at the expense of the German people. I mean the Krupp establishment for the manufacture of arms and accessories. And it is just such relations that hold the Government in England, in France, in Austria, and for all I know in the United States excepting that in the United States these companies do not flaunt their relations to the Government, if they have such relations. I know we are spending some-

thing like fifteen hundred dollars a day for smokeless powder—maybe it is more than that—\$4,200,000 a year; you can figure it out better than I can while I am thinking about something else. We are spending now \$146,000,000 a year on ships and our army. We are spending so much that if all the soldiers were dismissed and all the officers were dismissed, just the trimmings would keep the sum up to where it is now. We are maintaining forty-eight army posts where a dozen would be enough and the rest is local graft. The rest is such a swindle that if I was an army man I would vote to strike if the Government would not take away from us these unnecessary army posts and I would not play until they did. The same is true in regard to the superfluous places in the navy. That is all. I will tread easy.

You have heard just now something about the debt of the world. You may perhaps have read Rudyard Kipling's fable; he tells the story of how Dives, a very wicked man, and a rich man, down in torment, didn't like the accommodations there and who would? (Laughter.) So he made an offer to the Lord that if he would let him out he would go through the world and bring peace to all the nations. The Lord made an arrangement whereby Dives was let out and he went through the world selling sea power, the costliest thing there is, and land power, pomp and circumstance and all those things which the nations in their folly and superstition have been buying, which they don't want, and getting the nations all tied up in debt so they could not fight. Then the Lord sent forth some one to torment these nations to say to them all the mean things that Delcasse ever said about Germany, all the mean things Germany said about England, and to say all the mean things that anybody said about anything. They were tormented and disturbed and roiled, but they did not fight because they could not; they were bound hand and foot. Now this of course is a parable and a parable needs a little interpretation. In the first place his name was not Dives. In the second place he was not wicked and he was not rich and he was not a torment. He simply lived in a seven-story high-gabled house in Frankfort-on-the-Main. His first name was Mayer and because on the eaves of his house there was

a red shield of a pawnbroker the people called everybody that lived in the house "Rotschild." By and by when he had England turned over to him as his special property, the people of England called him "Rothschild," because that sounded more easy to the people of that nation who did not speak German very well. He was no child. He was the most astute financier that ever lived up to the time of J. P. Morgan, at least. I can go into the history of one nation in particular and explain this. In England when they had exhausted all the money that they could get hold of, all the money that they could borrow, there was fashioned a device to have the people borrow money. They knew the people had come to control some of the countries. England borrowed the money whereby she swamped Napoleon in waves of British gold. You know this story. England has owed the most of the four thousand millions of dollars that she borrowed then up to this time. Every child born into England anywhere from Land's End to John O'Groat's house has some ninety-two dollars to pay when he gets into England. Ten millions of them never pay it because they can not raise the money; two millions of them give it up from the start, live on nothing, and go through life simply picking up stuff that falls from the poor man's table. And now that an easy way was found, the other nations tried it. France, as you have heard, runs up six billions of debt; Russia, five billions; Italy, three billions; Spain, two billions, and the rest of them in their degree; Germany, over four billions—new Germany with Prussia. They can not borrow any more. And yet they want to put in one hundred and thirty millions, or whatever it may be, in armed ships to protect themselves from somebody, who if they took possession of Germany would have the great debt to pay before they could use the country.

I am not going to dwell on this part of it, except to say one or two little things that I have promised in my address, to connect as near as I can with the address of Mr. Green without duplicating any part of it even if I could duplicate it, for the whole matter has been presented in such a wonderful form that it can not fail to make its impression on you. What

makes a nation great? It rests finally on these two things: On the opportunity it gives to its men and women and on the power of these men and women to rise to the opportunities that are given. You remember that it was said that America means opportunity for a man to find the thing he can do and for the thing he can do to find the man that can do it. The great strength of America lies in that thing; not in its great extent of territory, not in that great wealth of forests, minerals and mines, for it is no larger than Russia in that respect; but in the fact that it makes the most of its men. Now, if you go over to Europe you will find everywhere that opportunity is not granted to the common man and that the common man can not rise to opportunity if it should be granted. He can not rise to seize opportunity and the first cause of this is the great burden of debt. That is the great burden that we know nothing about in America, the burden of debt that crushes absolutely. War is responsible because Europe spent very little on anything else excepting on the trimmings of war in times of peace. Secondly, war is responsible for the fact that the men can not rise to opportunity because always the strong and energetic, the men with initiative, the men that are bold and daring, that are not subject to weak influences and bad influences have been chosen for destruction. The bravest men have been chosen for officers and the officers are the ones that have fallen first.

I was talking the other day to a man who had been in the Naval College in Japan who told me that after the war scarcely any of the officers of his class in the college had survived, because, as has been said of our Civil War, "Those who fought most survived least." So it has been that the brave and strong all through the ages have been struck down; and the poor old, lame, halt and blind have been left to be the parents of the coming generation. These parents are men who take things as they are and do not attempt to rise, but if they do they rise only as the spirit of unrest. The spirit of unrest that is pervading the world is surely the result of the men that are left by war to do the things that strong men ought to do. The strong men are not satisfied with unrest; they turn in and fix things and then they have rest. There is no virtue

in this idle and aimless idea that we hear so much about and have inherited from the old world. The virtue is to turn in and do it right if the thing has been done wrong. The people of Europe are not the men that they ought to have been or that they would have been if the great widening wedge of sons and daughters of heroes had not been stricken out in the history of Europe. In the Gallery of Fine Arts in Brussels you will find a painting representing a scene in hell. The word in French does not mean as we usually think of the word "hell." It means down below where they gather up whoever they can gather up. In this picture you see Napoleon with his arms folded with all the dignity and strength of a field marshal. There, before him, are the four millions of men that he sent to death. They are not all shown in this picture, but the artist did his best to show these men. There are enough represented so that behind these you can imagine the great widening wedge of those who ought to have been the descendants of the four millions of men that Napoleon sent to death in his mad ambition. Booker Washington said the other day that when he was going through the different countries of Europe he felt that the outlook for these people of opportunity—reaching up, the chance to reach up, what we call in America opportunity—was not so good through the Continent of Europe as it was today with the negroes of Alabama. In other words, the negroes of Alabama, whatever be their social limitation, can make of themselves whatever they can; there is nothing to prevent their reaching any opportunity that they may have the strength to carry them to if they should try. You can not say that is true of Europe. The reason it is not true does not rest with the crowding of the people and is not resting with the poverty of Europe. It rests simply and solely with the great burden of past war and the burden of present war, the armed peace of Europe.

Then one more point. These points I do not pretend to have connected except as connected with the great matter of waste. I met a man the other day from Belgium who wrote an article on the conquest of Europe by America. By that he did not mean the conquest by force of arms. There is nothing in that. This whole business of armies will go out in a short time just as the old coats of mail have gone out of existence—go out partly through economic reasons, partly

through national reasons, partly because people of high circumstance will rise above this great superstition. He did not mean the conquest of Europe by the loaning of money from Wall Street, although a good deal of Europe has been conquered in that way. He did not mean the conquest of the shopping multitudes at the Bon Marche', nor the conquest of Europe by the long array of people that come across here and go back with American wives and at the same time with American gold. What is meant is the conquest of Europe by American ideals. These are two. One is internationalism. This audience is made up of all the people of Europe. Practically there is no race in Europe not represented. A gentleman on the train the other day said to me, in speaking of America: "It is in America that all hatred dies. My father was a German and my mother was a French woman, but what do I care for all that. I am an American. All hatred dies here." Nobody in this audience cares particularly whether the person next to him is from Germany, France, Scandinavia, or what country of Europe he may have come from. This is the land where all these traditions are gone. Under our flag all hatred dies away.

Secondly, besides this internationalism there comes the idea of democracy, the ideal of man. Now democracy and militarism can not get along together. Democracy means peace. Democracy and militarism in all its forms are opposed one to the other. So in asking for the conquest of Europe by the ideals of internationalism and democracy we mean the conquest of Europe by peace. The peace of Europe must come from the nation which has, with Canada and England partly, helped maintain for a hundred years a four thousand mile boundary along which there has not been a fortification or a warship or a soldier or a gun—where nobody is loaded and nobody explodes. That is what we mean by peace. (Continued applause.)

PRESIDENT BARTHOLDT:

The questions which you have heard discussed here will be decided in the Congress of the United States. How can you make your influence felt? A member of Congress is usually a politician. He listens to advice from home. But if one man or the other man singly or separately merely writes

him that has not very much influence. If an organization like the Missouri Peace Society demands of him to vote thus and so, then the cause of peace will be more substantially subserved. Of course, you do not have to send me a petition of that kind, because I would rather champion the cause which appeals to the hearts of mothers and to the intellect of man, I would rather carry the white flag of peace than be President of the United States. (Applause.)

Now, the Chair declares the Fourth American Peace Congress adjourned sine die. May the seed which has been sown here grow and prosper in the interest of the great cause of a more enduring peace. (Great applause.)

SUNDAY AFTER THE CONGRESS

Sunday, following the Peace Congress, was made notable by the presence of delegates in the pulpits of many of the St. Louis churches. At Liederkrantz Hall a German-American mass meeting was held. President Bartholdt presided. An address in German was delivered by Dr. Ernst Richard. The following resolution presented by the German-American Peace Society, of which Dr. Richard is president, and approved by the Fourth American Peace Congress, was distributed:

Resolved, That the Fourth American Peace Congress recommends to all Peace Societies and friends of international peace the study and discussion of the following question:

1. Whether an amendment should be proposed to the Constitution of the United States forbidding Congress to enter into any war except in case of failure of an honest effort to submit the question involved to arbitration and except in case of attack of our frontiers or coasts by hostile army or navy.
2. Whether legislation should be enacted making it obligatory that every treaty to which the United States of America is a contracting party shall contain a clause which provides that all differences arising in regard to such treaty as to its interpretation and execution shall be submitted to the Hague Tribunal for arbitration.
3. Whether legislation should be enacted forbidding the solicitation of subscriptions to war loans of foreign nations in the United States.
4. Whether the United States government should open negotiations with other nations for the conclusion of treaties pledging the contracting parties to mutually recognize their national independence, their territorial integrity, and their absolute sovereignty in domestic affairs, and whether a clause to this effect should be made a part of all treaties concluded by the United States.

COMMITTEES

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.

JAMES E. SMITH, Chairman.
DAN C. NUGENT, Vice-Chairman.

W. K. Bixby.	W. J. Kinsella.	Chas. P. Senter.
Ben Blewett.	A. B. Lambert.	R. D. Smith.
James B. Campbell.	W. H. Lee.	W. K. Stanard.
Samuel D. Capen.	Geo. D. Markham.	W. C. Steigers.
R. Vernon Clark.	Mrs. Philip N. Moore.	George J. Tansey.
Charles H. Flach.	Emmett M. Myers.	Festus J. Wade.
D. R. Francis.	David N. O'Neil.	C. P. Walbridge.
Edward Field Goltra.	H. L. Parker.	G. H. Walker.
Cecil D. Gregg.	H. W. Peters.	F. O. Watts.
H. R. Gregory.	Edward L. Preetorius.	Rolla Wells.
R. S. Hawes.	Edward B. Pryor.	Charles W. Whitelaw.
Walker Hill.	Tom Randolph.	Edwards Whitaker.
Manley O. Hudson.	E. Lansing Ray.	A. O. Wilson.
Charles W. Knapp.	Geo. D. Rosenthal.	Walter B. Woodward.
	A. M. Schoyer.	

FINANCE COMMITTEE.

BRECKINRIDGE JONES, Chairman.

Joseph R. Barroll.	R. S. Hawes.	A. R. Schollmeyer.
George W. Brown.	Lyman T. Hay.	G. W. Simmons.
J. S. Calfee.	Jackson Johnson.	Chas. A. Stix.
James Campbell.	Charles A. Lemp.	Festus J. Wade.
Murray Carleton.	James H. McTague.	C. P. Walbridge.
F. P. Crunden.	N. A. McMillan.	C. F. Wenneker.
H. N. Davis.	Elias Michael.	M. L. Wilkinson.
Edward A. Faust.	Tom Randolph.	A. O. Wilson.
T. H. Glancy.	Moses Shoenberg.	

INVITATIONS COMMITTEE.

ROBERT S. BROOKINGS, Chairman.

James G. Butler.	D. R. Francis.	W. D. Simmons.
W. K. Bixby.	C. H. Huttig.	Julius S. Walsh.
Adolphus Busch.	S. M. Kennard.	Thomas H. West.
Daniel Catlin.	F. H. Kreismann.	Rolla Wells.
B. F. Edwards.	T. H. McKittrick.	Edwards Whitaker.
	R. W. Shapleigh.	

PUBLICITY COMMITTEE.

R. H. STOCKTON, Chairman.

MILLER HAGEMAN, Secretary.

Homer Bassford, St. Louis Times.
 Charles E. Beals, 30 N. LaSalle St., Chicago, Ill.
 Paul W. Brown, St. Louis Republic.
 B. D. Butler, Springfield, Ill.
 Arthur Capper, Topeka, Kan.
 Mrs. George Dock, St. Louis.
 A. W. Douglas, Vice-President Simmons Hardware Co.
 Mrs. F. G. Eaton, St. Louis.
 J. J. Hall, 1201 Empire Building, Atlanta, Ga.
 George Harvey, Franklin Square, New York City.
 William Hirth, Columbia, Mo.
 Frank P. Holland, Dallas, Tex.
 George S. Johns, Post-Dispatch.
 Capt. Henry King, Globe-Democrat.
 Mrs. E. R. Kroeger, Webster Groves, Mo.
 Mrs. J. L. Lowes, St. Louis.
 Mrs. W. A. McCandless, St. Louis.
 William R. Nelson, Kansas City, Mo.
 Harrison Gray Otis, Los Angeles, Cal.
 Norval Richardson, Vicksburg, Miss.
 William H. Short, Secretary New York Peace Society, New York City.
 Miss Grace Taussig, St. Louis.
 Mrs. H. H. Tittmann, St. Louis.
 James L. Tryon, Secretary Massachusetts Peace Society, Boston.
 Mrs. R. G. Usher, St. Louis.
 Henry Wallace, Des Moines, Iowa.
 F. D. Warren, The St. Louis Star.

PROGRAM COMMITTEE.

MANLEY O. HUDSON, Columbia, Mo., Chairman.

Robert S. Brookings.	Mrs. Philip N. Moore.	Roland G. Usher.
Percival Chubb.	Luther Ely Smith.	Percy Werner.
Leon Harrison.	Selden P. Spencer.	

INTERNATIONAL LAW COMMITTEE.

FREDERICK W. LEHMANN, Chairman.

A. B. Browne.	Prof. George W. Kirchwey.
William C. Dennis.	J. H. Ralston.
Edward C. Eliot.	James Brown Scott.
Franklin Ferriss.	Daniel G. Taylor.
Frederick N. Judson.	Thomas Raeburn White.

EDUCATIONAL COMMITTEE.

A. ROSS HILL, Columbia, Mo., Chairman.

Miss Thekla Bernays, St. Louis.
 William H. Black, President Missouri Valley College, Marshall, Mo.
 Mrs. A. E. Bostwick, St. Louis.
 W. T. Carrington, State Normal School, Springfield, Mo.
 Dean W. W. Charter, Missouri State University, Columbia, Mo.
 P. P. Claxton, Commissioner of Education, Washington, D. C.
 W. S. Dearmont, Missouri State Normal, Cape Girardeau, Mo.
 E. T. Fairchild, President Agricultural College, Durham, N. H.
 Miss Amelia Fruchte, Central High School, St. Louis.
 Mrs. A. H. Gale, St. Louis.
 J. P. Greene, President William Jewell College, Liberty, Mo.
 J. M. Greenwood, Superintendent of Instruction, Kansas City, Mo.
 Mrs. D. F. Houston, Washington University, St. Louis.
 John R. Kirk, President First District Normal School, Kirksville, Mo.
 S. C. Mitchell, President University of South Carolina, Columbia, S. C.
 Mrs. L. W. St. Clair-Moss, President Christian College, Columbia, Mo.
 Mrs. E. W. Pattison, St. Louis.
 Mrs. E. H. Sears, St. Louis.
 Prof. H. E. Stout, President Howard Payne College, Fayette, Mo.

COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY COMMITTEE.

MURRAY CARLETON, Chairman.

J. D. Bascom.	Hudson E. Bridge.	W. A. Layman.
Julius C. Birge.	D. R. Calhoun.	H. L. Parker.
E. H. Boehnken.	Forrest Ferguson.	H. W. Peters.
James Brookmire.	S. H. Fullerton.	J. E. Pilcher.
A. D. Brown.	Peyton Carr.	Frank A. Ruf.
C. F. Blanke.	Frederick D. Gardner.	M. B. Wallace.
August A. Busch.	Goodman King.	C. F. Wenneker.

RELIGIOUS INSTITUTIONS COMMITTEE.

REV. WILLIAM J. WILLIAMSON, Chairman.

Rev. B. A. Abbott.	Rev. Horace F. Holton.
Rev. Clair E. Ames.	Rev. S. J. Huey.
Rev. John F. Cannon.	Rev. James W. Lee.
Rev. C. M. Davis.	Rev. Samuel J. Niccolls.
Rev. William Hackman.	Rev. M. Rhodes.
Rev. Arthur Hanfer.	Rev. Samuel Sale.

Bishop Charles W. Smith.

WOMEN'S ORGANIZATIONS COMMITTEE.

MRS. PHILIP N. MOORE, Chairman.

- Mrs. J. E. Cowles, Chairman Peace Committee, General Federation of Women's Clubs, Los Angeles, Cal.
 Mrs. W. H. Eliot, President Wednesday Club.
 Miss Vida Hunt Francis, Executive Secretary Association of Collegiate Alumnae, Philadelphia.
 Dr. Laura Drake Gill, President College for Women, University of the South, Sewanee, Tenn.
 Mrs. W. K. James, St. Joseph, Mo.
 Mrs. W. McNab Miller, Columbia, Mo.
 Mrs. Percy V. Pennybacker, President of the General Federation of Women's Clubs, Austin, Tex.
 Mrs. William Cummings Story, President Daughters of the American Revolution, 36 Gramercy Park, New York City.
 Mrs. E. M. Shepard, President Missouri Federation of Women's Clubs, Springfield, Mo.
 Dr. Mary E. Woolley, President Mt. Holyoke College, South Hadley, Mass.

RECEPTION COMMITTEE.

DAN C. NUGENT, Chairman.

DANIEL G. TAYLOR, Vice-Chairman.

- | | |
|------------------------|--------------------|
| Robert S. Brookings. | A. B. Lambert. |
| Sam D. Capen. | J. A. Lewis. |
| Gouverneur Calhoun. | Geo. D. Markham. |
| John D. Davis. | J. L. Mauran. |
| Dwight F. Davis. | C. P. Senter. |
| John Lionberger Davis. | Luther Ely Smith. |
| E. C. Elliot. | Wm. F. Saunders. |
| George L. Edwards. | George W. Simmons. |
| D. R. Francis. | A. R. Schollmeyer. |
| James M. Franciscus. | A. L. Shapleigh. |
| J. D. Perry Francis. | W. K. Stanard. |
| Walker Hill. | George J. Tansey. |
| Lewis S. Haslam. | Lewis T. Tune. |
| C. L. Holman. | G. H. Walker. |
| Clarence H. Howard. | F. O. Watts. |
| Samuel M. Kennard. | Oscar L. Whitelaw. |
| W. J. Kinsella. | F. A. Witte. |

AUXILIARY RECEPTION COMMITTEE.

J. LIONBERGER DAVIS, Chairman.

Roger N. Baldwin.	T. H. McKittrick, Jr.
Chas. E. Bascom.	W. G. McRee, Jr.
Edward S. Bedal.	Charles W. Moore.
Robert Burkham.	Charles H. Morrill.
Daniel K. Catlin.	Dan C. Nugent, Jr.
Eugene Cuendet.	Charles P. Pettus.
Dwight F. Davis.	Eugene Pettus.
Samuel C. Davis.	Charles M. Polk.
John B. Denvir.	Oliver S. Richards.
H. Chouteau Dyer.	Boyle Rodes.
Frederick B. Eiseman.	Alvin Secord.
D. R. Francis, Jr.	Philip C. Scanlan.
Henry T. Ferriss.	Horace M. Swope.
E. M. Grossman.	Stanley Stoner.
John H. Holliday.	George W. Simmons.
Samuel M. Kennard, Jr.	Stuart Stickney.
Hugh McK. Jones.	Harry B. Wallace.
Harry H. Langenberg.	James H. Wear.
Carl Langenberg.	Joseph W. Wear.
Frederick Lake, Jr.	Eugene Williams.
Walter McKittrick.	Erastus Wells.
Ralph McKittrick.	Lloyd P. Wells.

WOMEN'S RECEPTION COMMITTEE.

MRS. W. E. FISCHER, Chairman.

Mrs. Geo. L. Allen.	Mrs. D. G. Evans.
Mrs. Wm. Bagnell.	Mrs. Franklin Ferriss.
Mrs. W. K. Bixby.	Mrs. John Fowler.
Mrs. Hudson E. Bridge.	Mrs. Sam W. Fordyce.
Mrs. Howard Benoist.	Mrs. D. R. Francis.
Mrs. Arthur E. Bostwick.	Mrs. Arthur Gale.
Mrs. Paul Brown.	Mrs. Edward F. Goltra.
Mrs. Geo. O. Carpenter.	Mrs. B. B. Graham.
Mrs. W. R. Chivvis.	Mrs. Wm. A. Hardaway.
Mrs. Percival Chubb.	Mrs. H. L. Harkness.
Mrs. F. P. Crunden.	Mrs. Oscar Herf.
Mrs. J. D. Dana.	Mrs. Kate Howard.
Mrs. John T. Davis.	Mrs. Halsey C. Ives.
Mrs. Wallace Delafield.	Mrs. Breckinridge Jones.
Mrs. John O'F. Delany.	Mrs. John Kauffman.
Mrs. Henry Elliot.	Mrs. Henry W. Kiel.
Mrs. William H. Elliot.	Mrs. F. H. Kreismann.

Mrs. H. L. King.	Mrs. C. P. Pettus.
Mrs. Bransford Lewis.	Mrs. Tom Randolph.
Miss Mary Lionberger.	Mrs. T. G. Ratcliffe.
Mrs. Wm. McMillan.	Mrs. Jonathan Rice.
Mrs. Neil McMillan.	Mrs. E. H. Semple.
Mrs. W. S. McChesney.	Mrs. A. L. Shapleigh.
Mrs. R. McCulloch.	Mrs. G. H. Shields.
Mrs. G. D. Markham.	Mrs. Jas. E. Smith.
Mrs. Elias Michael.	Mrs. B. J. Taussig.
Mrs. J. L. Mauran.	Mrs. G. F. Tower.
Mrs. I. W. Morton.	Mrs. John R. Towler.
Mrs. H. G. Mudd.	Mrs. Festus J. Wade.
Mrs. Saunders Norvell.	Mrs. Rolla Wells.
Mrs. Dan C. Nugent.	Mrs. M. L. Wilkinson.

MUSIC COMMITTEE.

GEORGE D. MARKHAM, Chairman.

E. R. Kroeger.	Mrs. Joseph W. Folk.
Charles Galloway.	

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE.

C. L. HILLEARY, Chairman.

J. C. Beam, Jr.	F. D. Miller.
John Fitzgerald.	J. B. Modisette.
F. D. Gildersleeve.	Geo. F. Moore.
J. J. Hendricks.	J. D. McNamara.
A. Hilton.	R. J. McKay.
W. A. Lalor.	Frank O'Brien.
Geo. H. Lee.	C. Rudolph.
E. W. LaBeaume.	W. S. St. George.

Edmund A. Williams.

ENROLLED DELEGATES

(United States)

ALABAMA.

- Berry, Sidney, President, The Tribune, Mobile, appointed by the Mayor.
Brunnier, E. A., Editor Staats-Zeitung, Mobile, appointed by the Mayor.
Hansen, Clarence B., General Manager, The Item Publishing Co., Mobile, appointed by the Mayor.
Harris, Mrs. Seale, Government street, Mobile, representing Alabama Federation of Women's Clubs.
Henderson, Mrs. Charles, Troy, President Alabama Federation of Women's Clubs.
Penny, Mrs. James Edwin, 2122 Avenue I, Birmingham, Alabama Federation of Women's Clubs.
Seymore, Mrs. William H., 435 S. Court street, Montgomery, Alabama Federation of Women's Clubs.
Smith, Mrs. Harry Martin, Selma, Alabama Federation of Women's Clubs.
Snell, Mrs. Henry H., 1316 St. Charles street, Birmingham, Alabama Federation of Women's Clubs.
Thompson, Frederick I., President, The Mobile Register, Mobile, appointed by the Mayor.

ARKANSAS.

- Bradham, Hon. D. A., Warren, appointed by the Governor.
Coffin, Charles, Mayor of Batesville.
Dale, Mrs. John R., Texarkana, representing Arkansas Federation of Women's Clubs.
Ellington, Mrs. Olin F., Legal Department Missouri Pacific Railway, Little Rock, Arkansas Daughters of the American Revolution.
Ellsworth, Mrs. S. E., 808 Park avenue, Hot Springs, Arkansas Federation of Women's Clubs.
Evans, Rev. A. O., Little Rock, appointed by the Mayor.
Flickenger, Mrs. Louis, 1416 Center street, Little Rock, Daughters of the American Revolution of Arkansas, also Arkansas Federation of Women's Clubs.
Green, General B. W., Little Rock, appointed by the Mayor.
Hall, Prof. R. C., Little Rock, appointed by the Mayor.
Hardy, Miss Stella Pickett, 627 E. Main street, Batesville, Arkansas Daughters of the American Revolution.
Harris, Thomas H., Little Rock, appointed by the Mayor.
Miles, Hon. Lee, Little Rock, appointed by the Governor.
Moore, Mrs. J. I., Helena, Arkansas Federation of Women's Clubs.

Norton, Mrs. Helen M. B., 923 Scott street, Little Rock, Arkansas Daughters of the American Revolution.
 Poppe, Rev. A. H., Little Rock, appointed by the Mayor.
 Ramsey, Prof. W. A., Little Rock, appointed by the Governor.
 Roots, Mrs. Logan H., 923 Scott street, Little Rock, Arkansas Daughters of the American Revolution.
 Smith, Mrs. G. A. Forney, Little Rock, Arkansas Federation of Women's Clubs.
 Speer, H. C., Fort Smith, appointed by the Governor.
 Thebault, Mrs. Kate, Fort Smith, Arkansas Federation of Women's Clubs.

ARIZONA

Atwood, Rt. Rev. J. W., Phoenix, appointed by the Governor, and Arizona Commission of Agriculture and Horticulture.
 Douglas, Prof. James, Douglas, appointed by the Governor, and the Arizona Commission of Agriculture and Horticulture.
 Eads, Henry L., Phoenix, appointed by the Mayor.
 Granjon, Rev. Henry, Tucson, appointed by the Governor, and the Arizona Commission of Agriculture and Horticulture.
 Hughes, L. C., Tucson, appointed by the Governor, and Arizona Commission of Agriculture and Horticulture.
 Kimball, Hon. Andrew, Thatcher, appointed by the Governor, and the Arizona Commission of Agriculture and Horticulture.
 Lewis, R. Allyn, Phoenix, appointed by the Mayor.
 Matthews, Prof. A. J., Tempe, appointed by the Governor, and the Arizona Commission of Agriculture and Horticulture.
 O'Neill, Mrs. Pauline, Phoenix, appointed by the Governor, and Arizona Commission of Agriculture and Horticulture.
 Sartelle, J. C., Phoenix, appointed by the Mayor.
 Stabler, Prof. A. K., Phoenix, appointed by the Governor, and Arizona Commission of Agriculture and Horticulture.
 Waters, Hon. Albert L., Tucson, appointed by the Governor, and Arizona Commission of Agriculture and Horticulture.
 Whipple, Hon. Wm. M., Clifton, appointed by the Governor, and Arizona Commission of Agriculture and Horticulture.
 Wolfley, T. J., Phoenix, appointed by the Mayor.

CALIFORNIA.

Bone, Rev. Lawrence, Pastor of Calvary Presbyterian Church, Berkeley, representing The International Association of the Friends of Peace.
 Craig, Hugh, Mayor of Piedmont, the International Association of the Friends of Peace.
 Gaw, Prof. Allison, Los Angeles, University of Southern California.
 Gibson, W. E., President Oakland Chamber of Commerce, Oakland, The International Association of the Friends of Peace.

- Hoose, Prof. James H., Los Angeles, University of Southern California.
 Hunt, Prof. Rockwell D., Los Angeles, University of Southern California.
 Inui, K. S., San Francisco, California Peace Society.
 Jordan, David Starr, Leland Stanford, Jr., University, Northern California Peace Society and World's Peace Foundation.
 Krehbiel, Prof. Edward B., Leland Stanford, Jr., University, Northern California Peace Society.
 Root, Robt. C., 1101 Wright & Callender Bldg., Los Angeles, the Northern and Southern California Peace Societies, the Federated Peace Committee for 1915, San Francisco Interdenominational Peace Committee of the Pacific Coast.
 Stowell, Prof. Thomas B., Los Angeles, University of Southern California.
 Street, Cyrus H., Berkeley, the International Association of the Friends of Peace.
 Walker, Wilber, Secretary Oakland Merchants Exchange, Oakland, the International Association of the Friends of Peace.
 Wallace, Lieutenant-Governor, A. J., Los Angeles, University of Southern California.

COLORADO.

- Bradford, Mrs. Mary C., Capital Bldg., Denver, representing Colorado Federation of Women's Clubs.
 Evans, Mrs. Mary Frost, Fort Collins, the Woman's International Peace League of America.
 Goddard, Mrs. Frances W., Colorado Springs, Colorado Federation of Women's Clubs.
 Grubb, Mrs. Eugene, Carbondale, Colorado Federation of Women's Clubs.
 Rogers, Mrs. Freeman C., 1112 E. Ninth street, Pueblo, Colorado Federation of Women's Clubs.
 Spray, Mrs. S. J., Salida, Colorado Federation of Women's Clubs.

CONNECTICUT.

- Bowen, William, Ansonia, appointed by the Mayor.
 Emerson, James M., Publisher Ansonia Sentinel, Ansonia, appointed by the Mayor.
 Farrel, Major Alton, Ansonia, appointed by the Mayor.
 Munger, Judge Robert L., Ansonia, appointed by the Mayor.
 Rogers, Henry Wade, Dean of Yale Law School, New Haven, appointed by the Mayor.
 Smith, James T., Ansonia, appointed by the Mayor.
 Sneath, E. Hershey, 285 Whitney avenue, New Haven, appointed by the Governor.

DELAWARE.

- Brosius, Lewis W., Wilmington, representing Delaware Peace Society and Wilmington Chamber of Commerce.
- Burchenal, C. E., Wilmington, Chamber of Commerce.
- Cannon, Hon. Henry P., Bridgeville, appointed by the Governor.
- Colbert, P. M., Wilmington, Chamber of Commerce.
- Derickson, Joseph, Wilmington, Delaware Peace Society.
- Elliott, George A., 1413 Delaware avenue, Wilmington, appointed by the Governor.
- England, H. S., Wilmington, Chamber of Commerce.
- Hoffecker, Hon. James E., Smyrna, appointed by the Governor.
- Phillips, Charles S., 702 Washington Street, Wilmington, appointed by the Governor, the Delaware Peace Society.
- Mustard, Col. L. W., Lewes, appointed by the Governor.
- Reed, Rev. George, Wilmington, Chamber of Commerce.
- Rhoads, Jonathan E., 908 Franklin street, Wilmington, Delaware Peace Society.
- Richardson, Hon. H. A., Dover, appointed by the Governor.
- Smedley, Benjamin K., Wilmington, Delaware Peace Society.
- Stafford, Mrs. Ella P., 908 Franklin street, Wilmington, appointed by the Governor.
- Ward, Hon. H. H., Wilmington, appointed by the Governor.
- Worrell, Miss Emma, 1407 Rodney street, Wilmington, appointed by the Governor.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

- Ainey, Hon. William D. B., Washington, representing the American Branch of the Interparliamentary Union.
- Andrews, Mrs. W. E., 1225 Fairmont, Washington, President of District of Columbia Federation of Women's Clubs.
- Baldwin, Wm. H., Washington, Washington Board of Trade.
- Bartholdt, Hon. Richard, Washington, American Branch of the Interparliamentary Union.
- Burton, Theodore E., United States Senator, Washington, American Association for International Conciliation, American Peace Society, American Branch of the Interparliamentary Union.
- Call, Arthur Deerin, Colorado Bldg., Washington, American Peace Society.
- Claxton, Hon. P. P., Washington, Washington Peace Society.
- Curriden, Samuel W., Washington, Washington Board of Trade.
- Dadmun, A. H., Southern Bldg., Washington, Navy League of the United States.
- Downey, Wm. F., Washington, Washington Board of Trade.

- Estabrook, Emma H., 1026 Seventeenth street, N. W., Washington, National Arbitration Society.
- Gallup, Hon. William A., Washington, American Branch of the Inter-parliamentary Union.
- Gates, Dr. Merrill E., Washington, appointed by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia.
- Harris, G. W., 1311 F Street, Washington, Washington Board of Trade.
- Heflin, Hon. Thomas J., Washington, American Branch of the Inter-parliamentary Union.
- Hege, S. B., Washington, Washington Board of Trade.
- Kent, James G., 327 C Street, S. E., Washington, National Arbitration Society.
- Lockwood, Belva A., LL.D., 619 F street, Washington, National Arbitration Society.
- Macfarland, Hon. H. B. F., Washington, appointed by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia.
- McIntosh, Emily Harris, 150 A street, N. E., Washington, National Arbitration Society.
- Nicholson, Rev. S. Edgar, Washington, appointed by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia.
- Ralston, Jackson H., Washington, appointed by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia.
- Scott, James Brown, 2 Jackson place, Washington, appointed by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia.
- Trueblood, Benjamin F., Washington, American Peace Society.
- White, George W., Washington, American Peace Society, appointed by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

FLORIDA.

- Baker, Hon. W. H., Jacksonville, appointed by the Governor.
- Cay, Mrs. Charles, Tallahassee, representing Florida Federation of Women's Clubs.
- Dean, Hon. Bobo, Miami, appointed by the Governor.
- Dimick, Mrs. E. N., Palm Beach, Florida Federation of Women's Clubs.
- McKenzie, Hon. H. A. B., Palatka, appointed by the Governor.
- Montague, Mrs. A. P., Lake City, Florida Federation of Women's Clubs.
- Powell, Mrs. W. B., Tampa, Florida Federation of Women's Clubs.
- Robertson, Hon. J. G., Ocala, appointed by the Governor.
- Sears, Hon. Joseph, Kissimmee, appointed by the Governor
- Simonton, Hon. F. M., Tampa, appointed by the Governor
- Thompson, S. Boteler, Lake City, appointed by the Governor.
- Wescott, Mrs. Charles, Orlando, Florida Federation of Women's Clubs.
- Young, Mrs. W. B. Jacksonville, Florida Federation of Women's Clubs.
- Young, Hon. J. L., Plant City, appointed by the Governor.

GEORGIA.

- Bellamy, Mrs. E. Washington, 524 College street, Macon, appointed by the Governor.
- Benning, Miss Annie C., Columbus, representing Georgia Daughters of the American Revolution.
- Bocock, Dr. W. H., Athens, appointed by the Mayor.
- Broughton, Dr. Joe, Atlanta, Georgia Peace Society.
- Callaway, Hon. E. H., Augusta, appointed by the Governor.
- Cobb, Judge A. J., Athens, appointed by the Mayor.
- Cook, Rev. Osgood F., Waycross, appointed by the Mayor.
- Donalson, Mrs. John E., Bainbridge, Georgia Federation of Women's Clubs.
- Dunlap, Col. Samuel C., Gainesville, appointed by the Governor.
- Farr, Mr. James McP., Waycross, appointed by the Mayor.
- Goetchius, Hon. Henry R., Columbus, appointed by the Governor.
- Groover, Mrs. Clarence I., Columbus, Georgia Federation of Women's Clubs.
- Hall, J. J., 25 Porter place, Atlanta, Director American Peace Society for the South Atlantic States, representing Georgia Peace Society.
- Howell, Mrs. Clark, Jr., 741 Peachtree street, Atlanta, Georgia Federation of Women's Clubs.
- Johnson, Miss Eugenia R., 215 E. Carlton street, Savannah, Georgia Federation of Women's Clubs.
- Johnson, Mrs. J. Lindsay, Rome, Georgia Federation of Women's Clubs.
- Johnson, Hon. J. Lindsay, Rome, appointed by the Governor.
- King, Mrs. Porter, Atlanta, Georgia Daughters of the American Revolution.
- Lambdin, W. W., Waycross, appointed by the Mayor.
- Lott, Daniel, Waycross, appointed by the Mayor.
- Lynch, Dr. J. W., Pastor of First Baptist Church, Athens, appointed by the Mayor.
- McPherson, Dr. J. H. T., Athens, University of Georgia, appointed by the Mayor.
- Martin, W. T., Atlanta, Georgia Peace Society.
- Matheson, President K. G., Atlanta, University of Georgia.
- Meldrim, Hon. Peter W., Savannah, appointed by the Governor.
- Miller, A. G., Waycross, appointed by the Mayor.
- Moore, Wilmer L., Atlanta, Georgia Peace Society.
- Parks, President M. M., Milledgeville, University of Georgia.
- Pound, Dr. J. M., President of State Normal School, Athens, appointed by the Mayor.
- Powell, Dr. John H., Atlanta, Georgia Peace Society.
- Rounsville, Mrs. J., Rome, Georgia Daughters of the American Revolution.
- Snelling, Dr. C. M., Athens, University of Georgia.
- Speer, Hon. Emory, Macon, appointed by the Governor.

Van Hoose, A. N., Rome, Georgia Peace Society.
 Walker, Mrs. J. L., Waycross, Georgia Daughters of the American Revolution.
 West, W. S., Valdosta, appointed by the Governor.
 White, Rev. John E., Atlanta, appointed by the Governor.
 White, Dr. H. C., Athens, University of Georgia, appointed by the Governor.
 Winburn, Mrs. W. A., Augusta, Georgia Daughters of the American Revolution.

IDAHO.

Biethan, Mrs. D. H., Blackfoot, representing Idaho Federation of Women's Clubs.
 Bowerman, Mrs. Guy, Boise, Idaho Federation of Women's Clubs.
 Cartee, Mrs. Ross, Boise, Idaho Federation of Women's Clubs.
 Pittenger, Mrs. Fred, Boise, Idaho Federation of Women's Clubs.
 Truitt, Mrs. Warren, Moscow, Idaho Federation of Women's Clubs.
 Vollmer, Mrs. John, Lewiston, Idaho Federation of Women's Clubs.

ILLINOIS.

Alschuler, Hon. Samuel, Aurora, appointed by the Governor.
 Ball, Mrs. Ivanilla D., Clinton, representing Illinois Daughters of the American Revolution.
 Beals, Charles E., 30 N. La Salle street, Chicago, appointed by the Governor and representing the Chicago Peace Society.
 Becker, A. G., 100 S. La Salle street, Chicago, Chicago Peace Society.
 Boggs, Hon. Carroll C., Fairfield, appointed by the Governor.
 Braidon, Mrs. Clara V., Rochelle, Illinois Daughters of the American Revolution.
 Brown, Mrs. John Harvey, Divernon, Illinois Federation of Women's Clubs.
 Brown, R. E., 111 E. Main street, DuQuoin, appointed by the Governor.
 Butterworth, Mrs. William, Moline, Illinois Daughters of the American Revolution.
 Caldwell, Hon. Ben F., Chatham, appointed by the Governor.
 Cassidy, J. W., Granite City, Commercial Club.
 Chubbuck, Mrs. H. E., 349 Moss avenue, Peoria, Illinois Daughters of the American Revolution.
 Clifton, Theodore, 19 S. La Salle street, Chicago, Congregational Education Society.
 Cooke, Hon. George A., Aledo, appointed by the Governor.
 Coudy, W. J., Granite City, Commercial Club.
 Craig, Edward C., Mattoon, appointed by the Governor.
 Curry, A. A., Jacksonville, Shurtleff College.
 Decker, Alfred, Chicago, Chicago Association of Commerce.
 Delano, Frederick A., Chicago, Harvard University.

- DeMoulin, U. S., Greenville, appointed by the Mayor.
- Dietz, Frank, 227 N. Rochland street, Belleville, Commercial Club.
- Drew, C. E., Bunker Hill, Shurtleff College.
- Dunn, Rev. Edward M., Peoria, appointed by the Governor.
- Dutt, Rev. Meade E., Pastor of First Christian Church, East St. Louis.
- Elliot, H., Jr., East St. Louis, Business Men's League of St. Louis.
- Farmer, Hon. W. F., Vandalia, appointed by the Governor.
- Feigenbaum, F., 243 Collinsville avenue, East St. Louis, Young Men's Austrian Society.
- Flynn, Miss Amelia A., 1000 Langdon street, Alton, Illinois Daughters of the American Revolution.
- Forgan, J. B., Chicago, The American Bankers' Association.
- Garner, Prof. James W., University of Illinois, Urbana, appointed by the Governor.
- Gillham, Mrs. E. L., Edwardsville, Illinois Daughters of the American Revolution.
- Goddard, Mrs. Leroy A., 1419 N. State street, Chicago, Chicago Peace Society.
- Goddard, Leroy A., State Bank of Chicago, Chicago, the Chicago Association of Commerce.
- Green, Thomas E., The Plaza, Chicago, appointed by the Governor.
- Guaen, A. C., Collinsville, appointed by the Mayor.
- Hall, Edmund, Granite City, Commercial Club.
- Hanley, Mrs. John, 724 Broadway, Monmouth, Illinois Daughters of the American Revolution.
- Harker, Dr. Joseph R., Jacksonville, Illinois Woman's College, appointed by the Governor.
- Harmon, John F., Lebanon, appointed by the Governor.
- Harris, Norman Dwight, Ph. D., Evanston, Northwestern University.
- Hartmann, Louis J., 117 W. Third street, Alton, Alton Board of Trade.
- Hatfield, Charles F., 917 Ashland Block, Chicago, Field Secretary, Bureau of Conventions and Societies for the Panama Pacific National Exposition, San Francisco, 1915.
- Haynes, Mrs. L. C., 703 Pennsylvania avenue, East St. Louis, Illinois Federation of Women's Clubs.
- Henrotin, Charles, 70 E. Goethe street, Chicago, appointed by the Governor.
- Holbrook, Florence, 562 Oakwood boulevard, Chicago, Chicago Peace Society.
- Hoover, H. D., 1007 Buchanan street, Carthage, Carthage College.
- Hubbard, W. H., 314 E. College avenue, Greenville, appointed by the Mayor.
- Hull, Charles E., Salem, appointed by the Mayor.
- Hull, Lulu H., Salem, Illinois Federation of Women's Clubs.
- Hunting, Mrs. Eva S., Lincoln, Illinois Daughters of the American Revolution.

- Irion, Mrs. Charles, Congress street, Ottawa, Illinois Daughters of the American Revolution.
- James, James Alton, Ph. D., Evanston, Northwestern University.
- Jones, Jenkin Lloyd, Abraham Lincoln Center, Chicago, Chicago Peace Society.
- Karraker, David, Jonesboro, appointed by the Governor.
- Kiser, C. R., Madison, Granite City Commercial Club.
- Klee, Max, 1340 E. Forty-eighth street, Chicago, Chicago Peace Society and Chicago Association of Commerce.
- Klingberger, A. E., Granite City, Commercial Club.
- Kneedler, C. D., Collinsville, appointed by the Mayor.
- Kneedler, R. Guy, Mayor of Collinsville.
- Kohl, Emil J., Belleville, Commercial Club.
- Lafont, Eugene, Metropolis, appointed by the Governor.
- Lescher, Mrs. Nevin C., 445 Monmouth boulevard, Galesburg, Illinois Daughters of the American Revolution.
- Lewis, W. W., Greenville, appointed by the Mayor.
- Lyon, F. Emory, 629 W. Sixty-seventh street, Chicago, Chicago Peace Society.
- Martin, Charles A., Mayor of Mt. Carmel.
- Matheny, Rev. John, Loyola University, Chicago, appointed by the Governor.
- Mathews, Shailer, Dean of Chicago University, Chicago, Federal Council of the Churches of Christ of America.
- McManis, Charles N., 1813 Clawson avenue, Alton, Park College.
- Mephram, George S., East St. Louis, Business Men's League of St. Louis, Mo.
- Miller, Mrs. Flo Jamison, Wilmington, the Great Lakes International Arbitration Society.
- Moe, E. L., 4548 N. Pauline street, Chicago.
- Morriss, A. W., Granite City, Commercial Club.
- Mullen, Charles T., Belleville, Commercial Club.
- O'Mahoney, Rev. P. J., St. Viateur's College, Bourbonnais, appointed by the Governor.
- Pam, Max, Chicago, the International Peace Forum.
- Perrin, Frank, Belleville, Commercial Club.
- Pillsbury, S. W., Monmouth, appointed by the Mayor.
- Potter, E. T., Marissa.
- Potter, George M., Alton, Shurtleff College.
- Ravold, Dr. Louise, Greenville, Illinois Federation of Women's Clubs.
- Rendleman, Mrs. J. W., East St. Louis, Illinois Federation of Women's Clubs.
- Riggs, Hon. James M., Winchester, appointed by the Governor.
- Roach, Mrs. Helen A. C., Rushville, appointed by the Mayor.
- Rosenwald, M. S., Chicago, the Chicago Association of Commerce.
- Ryrie, J. M., Alton, Alton Board of Trade.

Schrader, H. C. G., Belleville, Commercial Club.
 Sexton, H. D., President, Southern Illinois National Bank, East St. Louis, representing The Business Men's League of St. Louis.
 Sheets, J. M., Oblong, American Peace Society.
 Smith, William Hawley, Peoria, appointed by the Governor.
 Stein, Geo. B., Mt. Carmel, appointed by the Mayor.
 Stein, J. Fred, Mt. Carmel, appointed by the Mayor.
 Stelzel, C. F., Granite City, Commercial Club.
 Stocking, Mrs. Helene, Rochelle, Illinois Daughters of the American Revolution.
 Thomas, T. F., Collinsville, appointed by the Mayor.
 Twing, Rev. Martin W., Alton, Shurtleff College.
 Uffer, C. A., Madison, Granite City Commercial Club.
 Vrooman, Carl S., Bloomington, appointed by the Governor.
 Wadsworth, Dr. J. L. R., Collinsville, appointed by the Mayor.
 Wale, George W., DuQuoin, Commercial Club.
 Wall, Judge George W., DuQuoin, Commercial Club.
 Wall, Willard, Murphysboro, appointed by the Governor.
 Webster, T. K., Chicago, The Chicago Association of Commerce.
 Wheeler, Harry A., Union Trust Co., Chicago, The Chicago Association of Commerce.
 Wheeler, H. N., Quincy, appointed by the Governor.
 Whitten, G. E., Granite City, Commercial Club.
 Wilder, T. Edward, 228 W. Lake street, Chicago, the Chicago Peace Society.
 Wilkie, R. F., Madison, Granite City Commercial Club.
 Williams, Hon. James Robert, Carmi, appointed by the Governor.
 Williams, Orva G., Chicago, the Chicago Association of Commerce.
 Wright, T. B., Mayor of Mt. Carmel.
 Wyckoff, D. A., Alton, Shurtleff College.
 Yates, J. A., Collinsville, appointed by the Mayor.

INDIANA.

Ball, Hon. W. C., Terre Haute, appointed by the Governor.
 Bell, Hon. Milton, Kokomo, appointed by the Governor.
 Beveridge, Hon. Albert J., Indianapolis, appointed by the Governor.
 Bingham, George U., South Bend, appointed by the Mayor.
 Bowers, Fred H., Huntington, appointed by the Mayor.
 Breen, William P., Fort Wayne, appointed by the Governor.
 Campbell, Myron, South Bend, appointed by the Governor.
 Cole, Rev. E. W., Huntington, appointed by the Mayor.
 Dougherty, Michael, Notre Dame, Notre Dame University.
 Durbin, Francis W., Notre Dame, Notre Dame University.
 Durbin, former Governor Winfield T., 1003 Jackson street, Anderson, appointed by the Governor.
 Durbin, Mrs. Winfield T., Anderson, Visitor.

Grose, George R., Greencastle, appointed by the Governor.
 Hershey, Amos, Indiana University, Bloomington, appointed by the Governor.
 Kendall, John, Mooresville, appointed by the Governor.
 McGinnis, James, Notre Dame, Notre Dame University.
 Morgan, Stephen, Notre Dame, Notre Dame University.
 Nicholson, Meredith, Indianapolis, appointed by the Governor.
 Noll, Father J. F., Huntington, appointed by the Mayor.
 O'Hara, James, Notre Dame, Notre Dame University.
 Stoltz, Dr. Charles, South Bend, appointed by the Mayor.
 Terhune, Rev. T. B., Huntington, appointed by the Mayor.
 Trueblood, Rev. W. O., Indianapolis, appointed by the Governor.
 Watkins, C. W., Huntington, appointed by the Mayor.
 Weber, John B., South Bend, appointed by the Mayor.
 Woodward, Fred, South Bend, appointed by the Mayor.

IOWA.

Bailey, A. S., Shenandoah, appointed by the Governor.
 Bailey, Mrs. W. H., Des Moines, Iowa Federation of Women's Clubs.
 Brown, Rev. E. Howard, Earlham, appointed by the Governor and representing the Peace Association of Friends of America.
 Bushnell, Mrs. D. W., 127 Bluff street, Council Bluffs, Iowa Daughters of American Revolution.
 Corlett, L. E., Oskaloosa, appointed by the Governor.
 Edwards, David M., Oskaloosa, appointed by the Governor.
 Evans, Mrs. W. D., Hampton, Iowa Federation of Women's Clubs.
 Ferguson, E. R., Shenandoah, appointed by the Mayor.
 Ferrell, Rev., Shenandoah, appointed by the Mayor.
 Hadley, W. J., 721 Parnell avenue, Des Moines, appointed by the Governor.
 Hamilton, D. W., Springville, appointed by the Governor.
 Hanson, A. J., Le Grand, The Peace Association of Friends of America.
 Hoskins, Rev. Alvin, Richland, Peace Committee Iowa Yearly Meeting of Friends.
 Howard, Edwin B., Ames, Life Member.
 Howe, Mrs. Henry J., Marshalltown, Iowa Federation of Women's Clubs and Iowa Daughters of the American Revolution.
 Jennings, G. B., Shenandoah, appointed by the Mayor.
 Johnson, O. C., Oskaloosa, appointed by the Governor.
 Jones, David H., Pleasant Plain, Friends' Church.
 Lewis, George H., Marshalltown, appointed by the Governor.
 McIntosh, Rev., Shenandoah, appointed by the Mayor.
 Meredith, Harlan, Lynnvile, appointed by the Governor.
 Montgomery, Mrs. Lettie Dodge, Council Bluffs, Iowa Daughters of the American Revolution.

Morrison, Mrs. T. N., Davenport, Iowa Federation of Women's Clubs.
Putnam, Dr. T. L., Shenandoah, appointed by the Mayor.

Reeves, Mrs. Winona Evans, Keokuk, Iowa Daughters of the American Revolution.

Secor, Alson, Des Moines, appointed by the Governor.

Shaw, Milton J., Springville, appointed by the Governor.

Smith, Edmund, Springville, appointed by the Governor.

Sprague, F. W., Des Moines, appointed by the Governor.

Stanley, Morris, Springville, appointed by the Governor.

Still, Mrs. S. S., 1716 W. 9th street, Des Moines, Iowa Daughters of the American Revolution.

Trueblood, W. L., Des Moines, appointed by the Governor.

Wells, Mrs. Cate Gilbert, Burlington, appointed by the Mayor.

KANSAS.

Capper, Arthur, Topeka, representing the Commercial Club.

Carr, E. M., Wellington, appointed by the Mayor.

Coleman, W. C., Wichita, representing the Federation of Churches.

Coppock, Stanley, 1616 University avenue, Wichita, appointed by the Governor and representing the Federation of Churches.

Dillard, W. P., Fort Scott, appointed by the Mayor.

Dillon, Prof. C. J., Manhattan, appointed by the Mayor.

Elliot, W. S., Manhattan, appointed by the Mayor.

Gleed, C. S., Topeka, The Commercial Club.

Godard, A. A., Topeka, The Commercial Club.

Goddard, Mrs. C. C., Leavenworth, Kansas Federation of Women's Clubs.

Guild, Rev. Roy B., 1325 Clay street, Topeka, appointed by the Governor, President of the Topeka Federation of Churches.

Haymaker, J. N., 913 Beacon Bldg., Wichita, the Federation of Churches.

Hoffman, Catherine A., Enterprise, Kansas Federation of Women's Clubs.

Hunter, George H., Wellington, appointed by the Mayor.

Jewell, J. R., Emporia, Commercial Club.

Knostman, E. L., Manhattan, appointed by the Mayor.

McLean, M. R., Wellington, appointed by the Mayor.

Mills, W. W., Topeka, the Commercial Club.

Moore, C. L., Manhattan, appointed by the Mayor.

Neighbors, C. A., Emporia, Commercial Club.

Parker, W. W., Emporia, Commercial Club.

Roser, E. B., Wellington, appointed by the Mayor.

Rumbaugh, Mrs. Isabella, Fort Scott, Kansas Federation of Women's Clubs.

Simmons, Mrs. J. S., Hutchinson, Kansas Federation of Women's Clubs.

Stanley, Edmund, Wichita, appointed by the Governor.

Thayer, H. E., President Fairmount College, Wichita, the Federation of Churches.

Waters, Henry J., Manhattan, appointed by the Mayor.

White, William Allen, Emporia, Commercial Club.

Wickwire, Mrs. E. G., Larned, Kansas Federation of Women's Clubs.

Willhite, O. M., Emporia, Commercial Club.

Woods, H. L., Wellington, appointed by the Mayor.

KENTUCKY.

Dickey, Mrs. J. H., 341 Birchwood avenue, Louisville, representing Kentucky Federation of Women's Clubs.

Hager, Hon. S. W., Owensboro, appointed by the Governor.

Hamilton, Col. A. W., Mt. Sterling, appointed by the Governor.

Hamilton, Dean Anna, Patterson Hall, Lexington, Kentucky Federation of Women's Clubs.

Helburn, Mrs. E. S., Middleboro, Kentucky Federation of Women's Clubs.

Hinitt, Dr. F. W., Danville, appointed by the Governor.

Kehoe, Hon. J. N., Maysville, appointed by the Governor.

Lang, Judge James M., Paducah, appointed by the Governor.

Neely, Hon. J. W., Franklin, appointed by the Governor.

Nichols, Hon. John, Danville, appointed by the Governor.

Powell, Rev. E. L., Louisville, appointed by the Governor.

Rodes, Hon. John, Bowling Green, appointed by the Governor.

Smith, David H., Hodgenville, appointed by the Governor.

Smith, Miss Sara Wallace, Frankfort, Kentucky Federation of Women's Clubs.

Stewart, Mrs. Cora Wilson, Morehead, Kentucky Federation of Women's Clubs.

Wheeler, Hon. Charles K., Paducah, appointed by the Governor.

LOUISIANA.

Aldrich, Morton A., Tulane University, New Orleans, appointed by the Governor.

Benoist, Lee, Bertron, Griscom & Co., New Orleans, representing New Orleans Board of Trade.

Burke, Walter J., New Iberia, appointed by the Governor.

Butler, R. B., Houma, appointed by the Governor.

Dumser, Adolph, President Metropolitan Bank, New Orleans, New Orleans Board of Trade.

Hart, W. O., 3706 Prytania street, New Orleans, Member of International Committee Peace Celebration 1914-15, appointed by the Governor, the Mayor, and representing the Chicago Peace Society.

Hart, Mrs. W. O. 3706 Prytania street, New Orleans, United States Daughters of 1776-1812 of Louisiana.

Lynch, P. P., Peter F. Pescud Insurance Agency, New Orleans, Board of Trade.

McClure, Robert C., New Orleans Import Co., New Orleans, Board of Trade.

McNeese, Oswald W., Baton Rouge, appointed by the Governor.

Monroe, P. M., Monroe, appointed by the Governor.

Roberts, Robert, Jr., Minden, appointed by the Governor.

Scarborough, Mrs. D. C., Natchitoches, appointed by the Governor.

Scroggs, R. L., State University, Baton Rouge, appointed by the Governor.

Shuttleworth, Mrs. Frances, Shreveport, appointed by the Governor.

Steinberg, George Wilfred, 623 Lafayette street, Baton Rouge, Louisiana State University.

Trezevant, M. B., Progressive Union, New Orleans, appointed by the Governor.

White, Melvin J., Tulane University, New Orleans, appointed by the Governor.

MAINE.

Baxter, James P., Portland, appointed by the Governor.

Blake, Edward H., Bangor, appointed by the Governor.

Butler, Edward H., Rockland, appointed by the Governor.

Carleton, Leroy T., Winthrop, appointed by the Governor.

Frye, E. M., Harington, appointed by the Governor.

Goodall, Ernest H., Sanford, appointed by the Governor.

Herrick, Addison E., Bethal, appointed by the Governor.

Marony, Charles L., Ellsworth, appointed by the Governor.

Phair, Thomas H., Presque Isle, appointed by the Governor.

Selders, George M., Portland, appointed by the Governor.

MARYLAND.

Baker, Hon. Bernard N., Baltimore, appointed by the Mayor.

Beacham, Robert J., Baltimore, representing Merchants' and Manufacturers' Association.

Blunt, Miss Alice K., 901 St. Charles street, Baltimore, Maryland Daughters of the American Revolution.

Bowdoin, Henry J., Baltimore, Merchants' & Manufacturers' Association.

Corkran, Mrs. B. W., Jr., Roland Park, appointed by the Governor and representing the Merchants' and Manufacturers' Association.

Davis, Rev. W. W., Baltimore, appointed by the Mayor.

Dawkins, Judge Walter J., Court House, Baltimore, appointed by the Governor.

Devries, Rev. B. F., Baltimore, appointed by the Mayor.

Dohme, Dr. A. R. L., Baltimore, Merchants' and Manufacturers' Association.

Dulaney, H. S., Baltimore, Merchants' and Manufacturers' Association.

- Flack, Dr. Horace E., Baltimore, Merchants' and Manufacturers' Association.
- Frick, Mrs. James Swann, 126 W. Franklin street, Baltimore, appointed by the Governor.
- Goldsborough, A. S., Baltimore, Merchants' and Manufacturers' Association.
- Griswold, B. H., Jr., Baltimore, Merchants' and Manufacturers' Association.
- Harlan, Henry D., Court House, Baltimore, appointed by the Mayor and representing the Maryland Peace Society.
- Hill, Hon. John P., Post Office Bldg., Baltimore, appointed by the Mayor.
- Hinkley, Dr. John, Baltimore, Merchants' and Manufacturers' Association.
- Hoen, Hon. Frank N., Baltimore, appointed by the Mayor and representing Merchants' and Manufacturers' Association.
- Hogan, Mrs. Cornelia S., Catonsville, State Regent Maryland Daughters of the American Revolution.
- Hubbard, Mrs. Wm. H., Chestertown, Maryland Daughters of the American Revolution.
- Hutzler, David, Hutzler Bros., Baltimore, appointed by the Mayor.
- Jencks, Hon. Francis M., Baltimore, appointed by the Mayor.
- Keyser, R. Brent, Baltimore, Merchants' and Manufacturers' Association.
- Levering, Eugene, 26 South street, Baltimore, Maryland Peace Society, appointed by the Governor, appointed by the Mayor.
- Maltbie, Hon. Wm. H., Equitable Bldg., Baltimore, appointed by the Governor.
- Markell, Mrs. Francis H., Araby P. O., Maryland Daughters of the American Revolution.
- Niles, Hon. Alfred S., Baltimore, appointed by the Mayor.
- Post, A. H. S., 10 E. Biddle street, Baltimore, appointed by the Governor.
- Richardson, Mrs. Albert L., 2127 North Charles street, Baltimore, Maryland Daughters of the American Revolution.
- Stockbridge, Hon. Henry, Baltimore, appointed by the Mayor.
- Stone, John T., 2938 St. Paul street, Baltimore, appointed by the Governor.
- Streger, Rev. A. Frederick, Baltimore, appointed by the Mayor.
- Taylor, Hon. Jonathan K., Baltimore, appointed by the Mayor.
- von Hahmann-Arning, Rev. Ernest, Baltimore, appointed by the Mayor.
- Warfield, Edwin, Baltimore Merchants' and Manufacturers' Association.
- Whitridge, Mrs. W. H., 604 Cathedral street, Baltimore, Maryland Daughters of the American Revolution.
- Williams, R. L., 1202 St. Paul street, Baltimore, appointed by the Governor.

Wylie, Hon. Douglas M., Baltimore, appointed by the Mayor, representing the Merchants' and Manufacturers' Association.
 Zimmerman, Rev. L. M., Baltimore, appointed by the Mayor.

MASSACHUSETTS.

Andrews, Mrs. Fannie Fern, 405 Marlborough street, Boston, appointed by the Governor.
 Angell, Norman, Paris, France, the World Peace Foundation.
 Capen, Hon. Samuel B., 85 Devonshire street, Boston, President Massachusetts Peace Society, appointed by the Governor.
 Forbes, Mrs. J. Malcolm, 280 Adams street, Milton, the Massachusetts Peace Society and the Massachusetts Federation of Women's Clubs.
 Mead, Mrs. Lucia Ames, 39 Newbury street, Boston, National Council of Women, also Peace Department of the International Council of Women.
 Mead, Edwin D., 40 Mt. Vernon street, Boston, appointed by the Governor and representing the World Peace Foundation.
 Tryon, Dr. James L., 31 Beacon street, Boston, Director of the New England Department of the American Peace Society, representing the Massachusetts Peace Society and Federation of Churches of Greater Boston.

MICHIGAN.

Anderson, Mrs. W. H., Houghton street, Cass City, representing Methodist Episcopal Church.
 Angell, Dr. James B., Ann Arbor, appointed by the Governor.
 Arbury, F. W., 402 Bowles Bldg., Detroit, appointed by the Governor.
 Ashbaugh, Mrs. R. H., 96 Boston boulevard, Detroit, Michigan State Federation of Women's Clubs.
 Barbour, L. L., 29 Buhl Bldg., Detroit, appointed by the Governor.
 Bollan, M., Havana, Great Lakes International Arbitration Society.
 Boyle, Homer L., 1023 Michigan avenue, East Lansing, Author of History of Peace, also a Plan to Influence Nations to Arbitrate All of Their Differences, appointed by the Governor.
 Bradley, Rev. N. S., Saginaw, appointed by the Governor.
 Crane, Caroline Bartlett, Kalamazoo, Michigan Federation of Women's Clubs.
 Diggins, Mrs. Delos F., Cadillac, Michigan Federation of Women's Clubs.
 Dyar, Miss Clara, Grosse Pointe Farms, Detroit, Great Lakes International Arbitration Society.
 Hartwell, Supt. E. C., Petoskey, appointed by the Governor.
 Hopp, Dr. W. F., 617 Mt. Elliott avenue, Detroit, The Great Lakes International Arbitration Society.
 Hunt, Harry E., 141 Arden Park, Detroit, the Great Lakes International Arbitration Society.

Hutchins, H. B., President University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, representing University of Michigan.

Jones, Dr. L. H., Ypsilanti, appointed by the Governor.

Ketcham, John C., Hastings, appointed by the Governor.

Kinney, Mrs. Jane M., Port Huron, Michigan Federation of Women's Clubs.

Livingstone, Hon. Wm., Detroit, the American Bankers' Association.

Milner, Mrs. Florence, Detroit University School, Detroit, appointed by the Governor.

Moore, Joseph B., Associate Justice, Lansing, appointed by the Governor.

Rogers, Herbert M., 5113 Prudden Bldg., Lansing, appointed by the Governor.

Shay, Lette, Harbor Springs, appointed by the Governor.

Sigel, Dr. Tobias, Breitmeyer Bldg., Detroit, the Great Lakes International Arbitration Society.

Stone, I. L., Battle Creek, appointed by the Mayor.

Stone, Mrs. I. L., 289 Maple street, Battle Creek, Michigan Federation of Women's Clubs.

Townsend, I. S., 20 E. Willis avenue, Detroit, the Great Lakes International Arbitration Society.

Watkins, L. Whitney, Jackson, appointed by the Governor.

Williams, Mrs. W. B., Lapeer, Michigan Federation of Women's Clubs.

MINNESOTA.

Jones, David P., Minneapolis, Minnesota Peace Society.

McLain, John S., St. Paul, Minnesota Peace Society.

Northrop, Cyrus, Minneapolis, President of the Minnesota Peace Society.

MISSISSIPPI.

Adams, Mayrant, Jackson, representing Board of Trade.

Bailey, Edward L., Jackson, Board of Trade.

Bennett, R. L., Hattiesburg, appointed by the Mayor.

Brame, Judge L., Jackson, Board of Trade.

Burger, Nash K., Jackson, Board of Trade.

Clancy, William, Jackson, Board of Trade.

Cranberry, A. E., Jackson, Board of Trade.

Hall, Peyton, Jackson, Board of Trade.

Hearon, E. C., Hattiesburg, appointed by the Mayor.

Johnson, Judge Paul B., Hattiesburg, appointed by the Mayor.

McDonald, Dr. J. D., Hattiesburg, appointed by the Mayor.

Sutherland, W. P., Jackson, Board of Trade.

Tally, Hon. John R., Hattiesburg, appointed by the Mayor.

Taylor, Homer W., Jackson, Board of Trade.

Walker, R. W., Jackson, Board of Trade.

MISSOURI.

- Adams, Arthur B., Fayette, representing Central College.
 Aid, C. T., West Plains, Commercial Club.
 Alcorn, Rev. W. G., Monroe City, Christian University.
 Alderton, Mrs. J. H., Ferguson, appointed by the Mayor.
 Arcularius, O. W., Washington, appointed by the Mayor.
 Atterberry, S. A., La Grange, appointed by the Mayor and Commercial Club.
 Bagby, Dr. W. B., Washington, appointed by the Mayor.
 Baskett, N. M., Moberly, appointed by the Mayor.
 Bayer, Mrs. Theodore T., Clayton, M. E. Church, South.
 Becker, E. B., Ironton.
 Berry, C. C., 208 Eleanor avenue, Ferguson, appointed by the Mayor.
 Black, William H., Marshall, President Missouri Valley College.
 Blackwell, Miss Bessie, Wellsville, appointed by the Mayor.
 Blackwell, J. R., Lee's Summit, appointed by the Mayor.
 Booth, L. F., Webster Groves.
 Boverie, Wm. C., Ste. Genevieve, Business Men's League.
 Boving, Charles B., Fulton, President Westminster College.
 Bryant, C. A., 1720 Grove avenue, Wellston, Local Wellston Socialist Party, Socialist Harmony Committee.
 Burger, Mrs. Nelle G., Clark, Missouri Peace Society.
 Burke, Rt. Rev. M. F., St. Joseph, appointed by the Mayor.
 Campbell, Rev. Frank Y., Cape Girardeau, Commercial Club.
 Campbell, H. F., Higginsville, appointed by the Mayor.
 Campbell, former Lieutenant-Governor Robert A., Bowling Green, appointed by the Mayor.
 Caruthers, J. Henry, Cape Girardeau, Commercial Club.
 Chilton, Rev. C. M., St. Joseph, appointed by the Mayor.
 Chomeau, Mrs. Henri, Clayton, M. E. Church, South.
 Clarke, M. B., West Plains, Commercial Club.
 Cole, Miss Lou, Pattonville.
 Coleman, Miss J., Villa Ridge.
 Coleman, E. E., Villa Ridge, "An Interested Visitor."
 Courtney, Rev. Daniel, White Church, West Plains Commercial Club.
 Cox, Dr. S. S., Wellsville, appointed by the Mayor.
 Cross, W. T., Columbia, Missouri Peace Society.
 Cupp, Chancellor Louis S., 3964 Warwick boulevard, Kansas City, Christian University.
 Dearmont, W. S., 903 College Hill Place, Cape Girardeau, appointed by the Governor.
 Dickbrader, J. H., Washington, appointed by the Mayor.
 Dietrich, Neils B., 2311 Francis street, St. Joseph, Presbyterian Church Federation.
 Dowell, J. E., Adrian, appointed by the Mayor.
 Ebeling, A. W., Warrenton, Central Wesleyan College.

- Elliott, John S., Boonville, appointed by the Mayor.
 Erdman, Rev. C. A., Adrian, appointed by the Mayor.
 Ess, Mrs. Henry N., 2416 Brooklyn avenue, Kansas City, Missouri
 Federation of Women's Clubs.
 Evans, Judge W. N., West Plains, Commercial Club.
 Evans, Wm. P., Jefferson City, Missouri Peace Society.
 Flow, Professor C. B., Fayette, Central College.
 Frank, Rev. Robert G., Liberty, Missouri Peace Society.
 Garn, H. M., Canton, appointed by the Mayor.
 George, Joseph H., 1136 Benton avenue, Springfield, President of
 Drury College.
 George, W. B., Lee's Summit, appointed by the Mayor.
 Gibson, John D., Webster Groves, Presbyterian Church.
 Greene, J. P., Liberty, President of William Jewell College, Missouri
 Peace Society.
 Greenwood, Mrs. James M., 2825 Troost avenue, Kansas City, Secretary
 of Public School Peace League.
 Griffith, Prof. Elmer C., Liberty, appointed by the Governor.
 Hallquest, Prof. A. L., Fulton, Westminster College.
 Harris, Judge David H., Fulton, Missouri Peace Society.
 Heefer, Charles, Higginsville, appointed by the Mayor.
 Helmers, John Warrenton, Central Wesleyan College.
 Henninger, C. J., Wellston, Business Men's League.
 Hill, John W., Wellston, Business Men's League.
 Hinchey, A. H., Cape Girardeau, Commercial Club.
 Hollenbeck, C. T., West Plains, Commercial Club.
 Holman, Frank H., Moberly, Commercial Club.
 Holt, Rev. Ivan Lee, Cape Girardeau, Commercial Club.
 Hudson, Manley O., Columbia, Secretary Missouri Peace Society, rep-
 resenting the Missouri University and the Columbia Peace Society.
 Hudson, Prof. J. W., Columbia, University of Missouri, Columbia Peace
 Society.
 Jacques, Henry P., Ferguson, appointed by the Mayor.
 James, W. K., St. Joseph, Commercial Club.
 January, Mrs. H. C., Ferguson, appointed by the Mayor.
 Janzow, O. E., Wellston, Business Men's League.
 Jones, Mrs. Lutie, Wellsville, appointed by the Mayor.
 Jones, Rev. William M., 309 S. 12th street, St. Joseph, Presbyterian
 Church Federation.
 Kaesser, Paul V., Wellston, Business Men's League.
 Keeley, R. F., Moberly, Commercial Club.
 Kimball, Mrs. Belle, Kirkwood, Missouri Daughters of the American
 Revolution.
 Kittering, Mrs. W. B., Hannibal, appointed by the Governor.
 Knapp, Mrs. Edwin A., Parkville, appointed by the Governor.
 Krug, Henry, Jr., St. Joseph, appointed by the Mayor.

- Kuhlman, Miss Louise, Flora avenue, Maplewood, Maplewood Christian Church.
- Kuhlman, Miss Margaret, Flora avenue, Maplewood, Maplewood Christian Church.
- Langtry, Rev. Walter M., Clayton, Pastor of Clayton Presbyterian Church.
- Leslie, G. E., Memphis, appointed by the Mayor.
- Lewis, Mrs. E. G., University City, President American Woman's Republic, appointed by the Mayor.
- Little, Andrew B., Moberly, appointed by the Mayor.
- Loeb, Isador, Columbia, University of Missouri, Columbia Peace Society.
- MacMinn, Rev. W. A., Kimmswick, Park College.
- Mather, Thos. B., Fayette, Central College.
- Macfarlane, Mrs. Geo. B., Athens Hotel, Columbia, State Regent Missouri Daughters of the American Revolution, appointed by the Governor, Columbia Peace Society.
- McElhinney, Hon. John W., Clayton, Amherst College.
- McIntire, Rolla, Mexico, Commercial Club.
- McKee, Judge E. R., Memphis, appointed by the Mayor.
- McRoberts, W. B., Canton, Christian University.
- Mahan, Hon. Geo. A., Hannibal, appointed by the Governor, the Commercial Club.
- Marvin, Fielding, Canton, appointed by the Mayor.
- Merritt, A. P., Wellsville, appointed by the Mayor.
- Miller, Charles G., Boonville, appointed by the Mayor.
- Miller, Edwin L., 407 Jackson avenue, Kansas City, Methodist Episcopal Church, "in favor of prohibition of the manufacture of firearms by international agreement."
- Million, John W., Mexico, Commercial Club.
- Millspaugh, Frank C., Canton, appointed by the Mayor.
- Monroe, Mrs. Margaret J., Carthage, National W. C. T. U., State Superintendent of the W. C. T. U. Peace and Arbitration Committee.
- Moocers, H. E., 38 Ballinger Bldg., St. Joseph, Presbyterian Church Federation.
- Morse, Miss Nettie, Normandy, American Woman's Republic.
- Morton, Rev. H. C., Memphis, appointed by the Mayor.
- Motley, Mrs. Robert Lee, Bowling Green, Missouri Federation of Women's Clubs.
- Mulcahy, Rev. Frank D., Canton, appointed by the Mayor.
- Murtaugh, Rev. Jas. A., Cape Girardeau, Commercial Club.
- Nash, E. Vernon, Fayette, Central College.
- Noel, Hon. G. H., Lee's Summit, appointed by the Mayor.
- O'Keefe, John C., Moberly, appointed by the Mayor.
- Oliver, Mrs. R. B., Cape Girardeau, Missouri Peace Society.
- Osterhout, O. S., Hannibal, Commercial Club.
- Otto, G. Henry, Washington, appointed by the Mayor.

Owens, Dr. J. F., 32 Ballinger Bldg., St. Joseph, Presbyterian Church Federation.

Parmelee, Maurice, Columbia, University of Missouri.

Perry, G. O., 323 Reed street, Moberly, Commercial Club.

Petrequin, Jules, Ste. Genevieve, Business Men's League.

Pettingill, Judge M. M., Memphis, appointed by the Mayor.

Piper, L., Wellston, Business Men's League.

Polloch, William, Mexico, Commercial Club.

Rattiff, Louis, Moberly, Commercial Club.

Ray, T. F., Poplar Bluff, appointed by the Mayor.

Reddish, F. C., Memphis, appointed by the Mayor.

Reed, C. W., Wellsville, appointed by the Mayor.

Reist, D. B., Adrian, appointed by the Mayor.

Reitz, George W., 2632 Roseland Terrace, Maplewood, Elmbank Avenue Methodist Church.

Reitz, Mrs. George W., 2632 Roseland Terrace, Maplewood, German Methodist Episcopal Church.

Richards, W. H., 2410 Francis street, St. Joseph, Church Federation.

Riedel, Henry, 1017 Bird street, Hannibal, Commercial Club.

RoBards, John L., 215 N. Sixth street, Hannibal, Commercial Club.

Rothwell, Hamp, 410 W. Rollins street, Moberly, Commercial Club.

Rowse, Mrs. E. C., 480 Oakwood avenue, Webster Groves, Missouri Federation of Women's Clubs.

Roy, Sydney J., Hannibal, Commercial Club.

Runk, Mrs. C. E., Princeton avenue, University City, appointed by the Mayor.

Rushton, John W., 701 N. College, Independence, the Reorganized Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints.

Salisbury, Margaret, Independence, Missouri Daughters of the American Revolution.

Salisbury, Mrs. Mark S., Independence, Missouri Daughters of the American Revolution.

Sauer, H. E., Moberly, Commercial Club.

Sampson, J. B., Lee's Summit, appointed by the Mayor.

Schaper, Jesse H., Washington, appointed by the Mayor.

Schierbaum, Rev. Wm., Canton, appointed by the Mayor.

Score, Rev. John, Clayton, Pastor of Methodist Episcopal Church, South.

Scott, George, Higginsville, appointed by the Mayor.

Scott, Mrs. W. H., University City, appointed by the Mayor.

Sevin, R. P., Higginsville, appointed by the Mayor.

Sheeley, Francis M., 903 W. Waldo street, Independence, Reorganized Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints.

Shepard, Mrs. E. M., 1403 Benton avenue, Springfield, President of Missouri Federation of Women's Clubs.

Shippy, Lee, Higginsville, appointed by the Mayor.

Shullenberger, W. A., 314 E. Love street, Mexico, Commercial Club.

- Skilling, Rev. David M., 43 W. Lockwood avenue, Webster Groves, Presbyterian Church.
- Slevin, E. O., Ferguson, appointed by the Mayor.
- Smith, Benjamin L., Moberly, appointed by the Mayor.
- Smith, Prof. T. Berry, Fayette, Central College.
- Sparks, Geo. W., Moberly, Commercial Club.
- Spencer, C. B., 1121 McGee street, Kansas City, Editor Central Christian Advocate, appointed by the Governor.
- Stanton, C. J., Ste. Genevieve, Business Men's League.
- Stopplet, Rev. S. W., Flat River, Commercial Club.
- Stormont, Clarence, Webster Groves, Third United Presbyterian Church, St. Louis.
- Stout, Henry E., Fayette, President, Howard-Payne College, Missouri Peace Society.
- Stumberg, G. W., St. Charles, Louisiana State University.
- Swinney, E. F., Kansas City, the American Bankers' Association.
- Taaffe, Mrs. Richard, Carthage, Missouri Federation of Women's Clubs.
- Tedford, May J., Moberly, Commercial Club.
- Terrill, Judge A. P., Moberly, appointed by the Mayor.
- Thomas, Mrs. Louise M., Lenox Hall, University City, American Woman's Republic.
- Walker, Mrs. John, 3540 Baltimore street, Kansas City, appointed by the Mayor.
- Walls, Samuel, Adrian, appointed by the Mayor.
- Watson, Flora C., Laddonia, Baptist Church.
- Watson, J. L., Laddonia, Martinsburg Baptist Church.
- Webb, Rev. Thomas J., Lee's Summit, appointed by the Mayor.
- Webb, Wm. A., Fayette, President Central College.
- Weeks, Mrs. E. R., 3408 Harrison street, Kansas City, National Congress of Mothers and Parent-Teachers' Association.
- Weidlich, Mrs. Wm., 6905 Washington avenue, University City, appointed by the Mayor.
- Weller, Joseph, Ste. Genevieve, Business Men's League.
- Weldon, J. B., Boonville, appointed by the Mayor.
- Whaley, V. H., Hannibal, Commercial Club.
- White, Mrs. Claudia Hazen, University City, Secretary of the Interior of the American Woman's Republic, appointed by the Mayor, the Arbitration Society, Washington, D. C.
- Whiteford, J. A., St. Joseph, appointed by the Mayor.
- Wilder, Andrew, Ste. Genevieve, Business Men's League.
- Wood, Rev. R. L., Adrian, appointed by the Mayor.
- Williams, Walter, Columbia, appointed by the Governor.
- Wynn, Rev. J. N., Pattonville.
- Youtz, Rev. Roy O., Canton, Christian University.

ST. LOUIS.

- Abbott, Rev. B. A., Pastor of Union Avenue Christian Church, St. Louis, representing Texas Christian University, Fort Worth.
- Abbott, J. F., 5231 Ridge avenue, Washington University.
- Adams, Judge Elmer B., 25 Westmoreland place, the American Peace and Arbitration League.
- Allen, J. H., 104 S. Main street, Compton Heights Christian Church.
- Alline, Rev. M. E., 5064 Cabanne avenue, Pastor of Fountain Park Congregational Church.
- Allison, Mrs. W. A., 1503 Obear avenue, Hyde Park Congregational Church.
- Allmeroth, Adam, 318 Lami street.
- Aloe, Louis P., 513 Olive street, Million Population Club.
- Altheide, A. A., 3027 Wyoming street, Corby Memorial Presbyterian Church.
- Alzheimer, Benjamin, The Buckingham, appointed by the Mayor.
- Anderson, A. C., 4537 Clayton Road, Seventh Day Adventist Church.
- Andrews, W. O., Third National Bank Bldg., Scruggs Memorial M. E. Church, South.
- Archibald, Russell, 5741 Garfield avenue, Reorganized Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints.
- Armstrong, A. H., 618 Wainwright Bldg., Church Federation of St. Louis.
- Axkert, Mrs. C. P., 5547 Chamberlain avenue, Maple Avenue M. E. Church.
- Badger, Mrs. W. H., 1527 E. Grand avenue, St. Alban's Chapel of Christ Church Cathedral.
- Bailey, Miss Josie, 2228 University street, Holy Cross House.
- Ball, Frank C., 2244 E. Red Bud avenue, Million Population Club.
- Bartels, Rev. Herman, 3738 Morganford road, St. John's German Evangelical Lutheran Church.
- Baumhoff, Mrs. F. W., 3501 Victor street, appointed by the Mayor.
- Beardsley, C. F., 2247 St. Louis avenue, St. Paul's Methodist Episcopal Church.
- Bedell, Dr. O. W., 1909 Lafayette avenue, Lafayette Park Baptist Church.
- Belek, Miss Rose, 3501 Nebraska avenue, Bethlehem Congregational Church.
- Bemis, S. A., 5099 Westminster place, Second Baptist Church.
- Bensinger, Joseph, 1012 Market street, Bethlehem Congregational Church.
- Bernays, Miss Thekla M., 378 N. Taylor avenue.
- Biby, U. G., 4666a St. Ferdinand avenue, St. Luke's Methodist Episcopal Church.
- Birge, Julius C., Vice-President, Ames Shovel and Tool Co., Business Men's League.

- Birkhead, Rev. Leon Milton, 5639 Cates avenue, Pastor of Wagoner Memorial Methodist Episcopal Church.
- Bissell, Miss Anna C., Baden Station, Bellefontaine Methodist Church.
- Bitting, Rev. W. C., 5109 Waterman avenue, Church Peace League, appointed by the Mayor.
- Bixby, Wm. K., Lindell and Kingshighway, appointed by the Mayor.
- Blair, Albert, 5052 Westminster place, representing Christian University.
- Blanke, C. F., Seventh street and Clark avenue, Business Men's League.
- Blayney, D. Vincent, 5872 Maple avenue, representing Park College.
- Blodgett, Henry W., Chemical Bldg., appointed by the Mayor.
- Blodgett, Mrs. William A., Washington Hotel, National Congress of Mothers and Parent-Teachers' Association.
- Bohne, J. C., 7327 Vermont avenue, Carondelet Baptist Church.
- Boughton, Judson, 6345 Berlin avenue, St. Michael's and All Angels' Church.
- Bowers, Rev. Wayne, 5437 Page avenue, Pastor Maple Avenue Reformed Church.
- Brandt, Rev. John L., 4526 Westminster place, Pastor of First Christian Church.
- Brant, Rev. Otto, 1212 N. Fourteenth street, St. Paul's Benevolent Association.
- Braun, Theodore, 1511 College avenue.
- Brennan, Rev. Martin S., 6304 Minnesota avenue, Sts. Mary and Joseph Church.
- Brittain, Rev. A., 3666 Arsenal street, Pastor of St. John's Church.
- Broadhead, Rev. James N., 2117 McCausland avenue, Immanuel Methodist Church.
- Brodtt, Rev. John G., 5255 Maffitt avenue, Pastor of Third United Presbyterian Church.
- Bronsgeest, Rev. H., 3628 Lindell boulevard, St. Francis Xavier's Church.
- Brookings, Robert S., representing Washington University and the American Society for the Settlement of International Disputes.
- Brown, Charles S., 2337 St. Louis avenue, Manufacturers' and Exporters' Association.
- Brown, Edward, 2311 Russell avenue, St. Agnes' Church.
- Brown, G. W., The Brown Shoe Co., Business Men's League.
- Brunk, Charles A. O., Odd Fellows' Bldg., appointed by the Mayor.
- Bryan, P. Taylor, 4346 McPherson avenue, representing Princeton University.
- Burg, William, Merchants Exchange Bldg., Business Men's League.
- Buschman, Mrs. Alvine, 4217 Morgan street, First Presbyterian Church.
- Butler, Col. C. C., American Hotel, appointed by the Mayor.
- Butler, Howard A., 6220 Julian avenue, Mt. Auburn Methodist Episcopal Church, South.
- Butler, James G., 4484 W. Pine boulevard, Business Men's League.

- Campbell, C. M., Franklin and Channing avenues, Trinity Presbyterian Church.
- Carpenter, Geo. O., 1101 Liggett Bldg., Business Men's League.
- Casey, Rev. E. A., 1368 Tamm avenue, St. James' Church.
- Chapman, Rev. L. A., 1445 E. Grand avenue, Fourth Christian Church.
- Chapman, Mrs. L. A., 1445 E. Grand avenue, Fourth Christian Church.
- Chaudet, Mrs. F. A., 4176a Delmar avenue, American Woman's Republic.
- Chivvis, Mrs. W. R., 4232 W. Pine boulevard, Missouri Federation of Women's Clubs.
- Christy, W. T., 14 S. Taylor avenue, Christy Memorial Church.
- Clark, Charles N., Lafayette and Missouri avenues, Lafayette Park Methodist Church.
- Clark, Rev. Elmer I., 30 Columbia avenue, Pastor of University Methodist Church.
- Clarke, Mrs. Wm. Lee, 382 N. Taylor avenue, representing W. R. C. Study Club.
- Clippard, A. B., 3935 Ashland avenue, Manufacturers' and Exporters' Association.
- Clucas, W. L., 3850 Humphrey street, Oak Hill Presbyterian Church.
- Coffey, Rev. J. T., 2315 Mullanphy street, Catholic Archdiocese of St. Louis, appointed by the Archbishop.
- Cole, Rev. Clifford E., 3135 Magnolia avenue, Pastor of Compton Heights Christian Church.
- Collins, Col. Martin J., Graham Paper Co., appointed by the Mayor.
- Costello, T. B., 2519 St. Louis avenue, Church of the Sacred Heart.
- Couzins, Phoebe W., 4561 McKinley avenue, appointed by the Governor.
- Cowdery, Dr. C. C., 5643 Cabanne avenue, Hamilton Avenue Christian Church.
- Coyle, James F., Yale and Cornell streets, Manufacturers' and Exporters' Association.
- Crandall, W. D., 4715 Newcomb place, Euclid Avenue Baptist Church.
- Curtis, Wm. S., Washington University, appointed by the Mayor.
- Daues, Charles H., United States District Attorney's office, appointed by the Mayor.
- Davis, Edwin G., 5442 Page avenue, Delmar Avenue Baptist Church.
- Davis, H. N., 56 Vandeventer place, representing Princeton University and Business Men's League.
- Davis, J. D., Wydown boulevard and Pennsylvania avenue, Princeton University.
- Day, Robert C., Day Rubber Co., appointed by the Mayor.
- Dean, Mrs. R. H., 1704 Marcus avenue, Third United Presbyterian Church.
- Decker, Rev. Charles H., 6451 S. Kingshighway, Church of Our Redeemer.
- Desloge, George T., St. Louis University.

- Dillard, J. E., 4511 Washington boulevard, Delmar Avenue Baptist Church.
- Dobyns, J. S., St. Louis, Westminster College.
- Donk, E. C., 314 N. Fourth street, Business Men's League.
- Donnan, W. Q., 1217 Victor street, Pastor of Marvin Memorial Methodist Episcopal Church, South.
- Dudeck, Miss M., 7048 Wise avenue, Christ Evangelical Church.
- Dugan, Rev. Charles E., 726 Dover place, Pastor of Dover Place Christian Church.
- Dunhaupt, R. C. F., 4022 Peck street, Hyde Park Congregational Church.
- Dunkerly, J. B., 5232 Ridge avenue, Hammett Place Christian Church.
- Eckmann, Otto, 6451 S. Kingshighway, Church of Our Redeemer.
- Edington, Mrs. R. P., 6210 Virginia avenue, Dover Place Christian Church.
- Eitelgeorge, Rev. F. S., 4308 Gano avenue, appointed by Methodist Episcopal Conference.
- Eitman, Mrs. F. G., 6007 Columbia avenue, Third Church of Christ, Scientist.
- Elliot, Edward C., A. M., LL. B., Washington University.
- Elliot, Thomas J., 8112 Church Road, Reorganized Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints.
- Ellis, Mrs. Margaret, 3700 Delmar boulevard, appointed by the Mayor.
- Engler, Edmund A., Ph. D., Washington University.
- Eschbach, Allen Gehman, 1246 N. Euclid avenue, Euclid Avenue Baptist Church.
- Evetz, Rev. Emil, 4433 Elmbank avenue, Pastor of German Methodist Episcopal Church.
- Eyeleshymer, A. C., 5929 Julian avenue, St. Louis University.
- Fath, Arthur, 3833 Oregon avenue, Church of the Good Shepherd.
- Faust, E. A., Second Vice-President, Anheuser-Busch Brewing Co., Business Men's League.
- Feuerbacher, F. W., 2705 S. Broadway, Manufacturers' and Exporters' Association.
- Fitzsimmons, Arthur J., appointed by the Mayor.
- Flory, Joseph, 4168 Shenandoah avenue, Compton Heights Baptist Church.
- Folk, Ex-Governor Joseph W., 5829 Cates avenue, appointed by the Mayor.
- Forse, Charles, Ninth and Chestnut streets, First Christian Church.
- Fouke, Mrs. Philip B., 306 N. Newstead avenue, representing Vassar College.
- Francis, D. R., 214 N. Fourth street, former Governor of Missouri, Business Men's League, appointed by the Governor.
- Frank, Nathan, 1027 Century Bldg., Business Men's League.
- Fricke, Christ, 639 Harris avenue, St. James' Evangelical Church.

- Fritzscheier, Rev. W., 2833 N. Grand avenue, First German Congregational Church.
- Fruchte, Miss Amelia, 4411 Washington avenue, appointed by the Mayor.
- Fuerbringer, L., 2619 Winnebago street, Concordia Seminary.
- Fuller, F. L., 27 Lenox place, Central Presbyterian Church.
- Fulton, Edward H., 3924 Juniata avenue, St. John's Church.
- Furlong, Frank P., 210 N. Tenth street, St. Columbkille's Church.
- Furlong, Rev. J. J., 8202 Michigan avenue, Pastor of St. Columbkille's Church.
- Gaennie, Frank, Times Bldg., Million Population Club, and Manufacturers' and Exporters' Association.
- Gallup, John, 5869 Clemens avenue, Compton Heights Baptist Church.
- Gardner, Col. Frederick D., 4506 W. Pine boulevard, appointed by the Mayor, Business Men's League.
- Gatch, Elias S., Third National Bank Bldg., Business Men's League.
- Gerhart, Frank H., 4900 Lindell boulevard, appointed by the Mayor.
- Gibbons, E. T., 2221 University street, Church of The Sacred Heart.
- Gibson, Maude, Baden Station, Bellefontaine Methodist Episcopal Church, South.
- Gibson, Mrs. W. B., 6240 Berthold avenue, Memorial Congregational Church.
- Glennon, Archbishop J. J., 3810 Lindell boulevard, appointed by the Mayor.
- Godbey, Rev. A. H., Baden Station, Bellefontaine Methodist Episcopal Church, South.
- Godbey, Mrs. A. H., Baden Station, Bellefontaine Methodist Episcopal Church, South.
- Godbey, Beulah, Baden Station, Bellefontaine Methodist Church, South.
- Godbey, Rev. J. E., 4347 Taft avenue, Pastor of Christy Memorial Church.
- Godbey, Mrs. J. E., 4347 Taft avenue, Christy Memorial Church.
- Goff, Rev. Francis Lee, 6127 Magnolia avenue, Pastor of Clifton Heights Presbyterian Church.
- Grant, L. W., Carleton Bldg., Union Avenue Christian Church.
- Gray, Mrs. Ben F., Jr., 4411 McPherson avenue, Missouri Daughters of the American Revolution.
- Green, Mrs. Augustus H., 4542 Cote Brillante avenue, Wagoner Place Methodist Church.
- Green, Mrs. S. McK., 3815 Magnolia avenue, Missouri Daughters of the American Revolution.
- Greene, Rev. Thomas E., 2044 Geyer avenue, Pastor of Bethlehem Congregational Church.
- Gilbreath, Rev. J. Charles, 7026 Virginia avenue, Pastor of Carondelet Methodist Episcopal Church.

Goessling, Fred W., Blair avenue and Mullanphy street, St. Paul's Methodist Church, South.

Guy, William E., 10 Portland place, Second Presbyterian Church.

Hackman, Rev. William, 4019 St. Louis avenue, Church Federation of St. Louis.

Haenni, Louis, Wainwright Bldg., appointed by the Mayor.

Haeseler, Albert H., Wainwright Bldg., North American Gymnastic Union.

Haller, Julius, 3157 Portia avenue, Memorial Methodist Episcopal Church.

Halter, E. A., 4310 Evans avenue, Salem Church.

Hanson, P. M., 5735 Chamberlain avenue, Manufacturers' and Exporters' Association.

Harper, Dr. James P., St. Louis University.

Harris, Bernard, 4825 Fountain avenue, Million Population Club.

Harris, Elihu F., 6291 Reber place, Pastor of Clifton Heights Christian Church.

Harrison, Rabbi Leon, 5610 Cabanne avenue, appointed by the Mayor.

Hartmann, Henry, Odd Fellows' Bldg., appointed by the Mayor.

Harvey, James C., Harvey-Faust Brokerage Co., St. Louis, representing New Orleans Board of Trade.

Haw, Marvin T., 2345 St. Louis avenue, St. Paul's Methodist Episcopal Church, South.

Haynes, Mrs. Effie Cave, 3525 Bell avenue.

Hedges, Isaac A., 710 Spruce street, Million Population Club.

Heller, Prof. Otto, Washington University.

Henry, Fred E., 2341 S. Compton avenue, Third Church of Christ, Scientist.

Herriott, R. M., 3501 University street, North Presbyterian Church.

Herzog, Peter, 3219 Bailey avenue, North American Gymnastic Union.

Hess, George J., 501 N. Seventh street, Business Men's League.

Hewitt, Andrew J., 6106 Victoria avenue, Memorial Congregational Church.

Hewitt, John G., 6107 Victoria avenue, Memorial Congregational Church.

Hewson, Rev. Earl, 2739 Dalton avenue, Pastor Reber Place Congregational Church.

Higson, John W., 4149 Cleveland avenue, Church of the Good Shepherd.

Hildenbrandt, Miss Jennie, 3176 Gustine avenue, National Congress of Mothers and Parent-Teachers' Association.

Hill, P., 2122 McCausland avenue, St. James' Church.

Hirschberg, Mrs. Mary, the Woman's International Peace League of America.

Hodgdon, H. H., 3110 Eads avenue, Compton Heights Christian Church.

Hoffman, G. Phil., 3517 Greer avenue, First German Evangelical Congregational Church.

Hogan, Granville, Chemical Bldg., appointed by the Mayor.

- Holmes, J. Howard, Tenth and Spruce streets, Business Men's League.
- Holton, Rev. Horace F., 4254 Olive street, Amherst College.
- Hough, Warwick M., Rialto Bldg., the American Society for the Judicial Settlement of International Disputes.
- Houser, D. M., St. Louis Globe-Democrat, appointed by the Mayor.
- Howland, Chas. P., 2052 McCausland avenue, St. James' Church.
- Hucke, P. M., 3521 Park avenue, Nord Amerikanischer Turnerbund.
- Huey, Rev. S. G., 4022 McPherson avenue, Pastor of Grand Avenue United Presbyterian Church.
- Huey, Mrs. S. G., 4022 McPherson avenue, Grand Avenue United Presbyterian Church.
- Hulich, Miss Harriet C., 4133 Morgan street, American Woman's Republic.
- Humphrey, H. G., 2510 Clifton avenue, Fry Memorial Methodist Episcopal Church.
- Ingalls, Mrs. E. B., 5250 Westminster place, W. C. T. U. Department of Peace and International Arbitration.
- Isler, Rev. William F., 2909 Michigan avenue, Pastor of Nuelsen Methodist Episcopal Church.
- Ittleson, Henry, Security Bldg., Business Men's League.
- Jacobs, Mrs. H., 4822 St. Louis avenue, Fourth Baptist Church.
- Jennings, C. N., 2846 Russell avenue, St. John's Church.
- Jennings, Dr. M. D., 4141 Washington avenue, Reber Place Congregational Church.
- Jennings, Rev. Oliver W., 2141 E. Fair avenue, Pastor of Second Christian Church.
- Johansen, Mrs. J., 2856 Henrietta street, Swedish Evangelical Congregational Church.
- Johns, G. S., 4548 Forest Park boulevard, representing Princeton University.
- Johnson, C. O., 2804 Russell avenue, Gethsemane Swedish Lutheran Church.
- Johnson, Prof. G. R., 734 Dover place, Carondelet Baptist Church.
- Johnson, Henry H., 3631 Page avenue, Scruggs Memorial Methodist Episcopal Church, South.
- Johnson, W. R., 5055 Vernon avenue, First United Presbyterian Church.
- Johnston, Rev. W. G., 5824 Page avenue, Hammett Place Christian Church.
- Johnston, W. J., 3610 Forest Park boulevard, Grand Avenue United Presbyterian Church.
- Jones, G. W., 5844 Maple avenue, Manufacturers' and Exporters' Association.
- Jones, Rev. Herman, 946 Maryville avenue, Pastor Trinity Presbyterian Church.
- Jones, James C., Third National Bank Bldg., Business Men's League.
- Kallmeyer, Otto, 3238 Barrett street, North American Gymnastic Union.

- Karbe, Otto F., 710 Carleton Bldg., Million Population Club.
- Kehl, Mrs. F. A., 5557 Chamberlain avenue, Maple Avenue Methodist Episcopal Church.
- Kennedy, Al. J., 4287 Olive street, Million Population Club.
- Kerwing, Samuel, Eleventh and Franklin avenue, Nuelsen Methodist Episcopal Church.
- Keys, Mrs. C. M., 5700 Clemens avenue, appointed by the Mayor.
- Keys, Mrs. Marcella E., 5700 Clemens avenue, appointed by the Mayor.
- Kiel, Ernst H., 1954 E. Warne avenue, St. Jakobi Church.
- King, Goodman, 78 Vandeventer place, St. Louis Manufacturers' and Exporters' Association, and Million Population Club.
- King, Capt. Henry, St. Louis Globe-Democrat, appointed by the Mayor.
- King, Rev. Jas. F., 2617 Potomac street, St. Luke's Methodist Episcopal Church.
- King, Rev. William Wirt, 4412 Lindell boulevard, Lindell Avenue Methodist Episcopal Church.
- Klock, H. F., 1319 Clinton street, Second Christian Church.
- Knapp, Charles W., The Republic, appointed by the Mayor.
- Kneffler, Mrs. Daniel W., Syndicate Trust Bldg., appointed by the Mayor.
- Knight, W. B., 4568 Cook avenue, First United Presbyterian Church.
- Koch, Mrs. H. W., 2738 Accomac street, National Congress of Mothers and Parent-Teachers' Association.
- Kreismann, F. H., former Mayor of St. Louis, representing The Business Men's League.
- Kretzschmar, Richard, 2243 S. Jefferson avenue, Pastor of Emmaus Lutheran Church.
- Kroehle, Ernest, 5587 Page avenue, Church of the Good Shepherd.
- Kruse, Aug. J., 2491 Geraldine avenue, Second Christian Church.
- Kulp, Rev. Edmund J., 5545 Maple avenue, Pastor of Maple Avenue Methodist Episcopal Church.
- La Four, H. J., 1309 St. Louis avenue, Fourth Baptist Church.
- Lake, Fred C., 4360 Westminster place, Business Men's League.
- Langsdorf, Prof. A. S., M. M. E., Washington University.
- Lazarus, Sam, National Bank of Commerce Bldg., Million Population Club.
- Leahy, John S., Christian Brothers' College.
- Lee, W. H., President of Merchants-Laclede National Bank, Business Men's League.
- Lehmann, Mrs. F. W., 10 Benton Place, representing Wellesley College.
- Leschen, Henry, 1 Windermere place, Manufacturers' and Exporters' Association.
- Leviston, J. A., 4943 Terry avenue, Wellston Business Men's League.
- Leviston, Mrs. J. A., 4943 Terry avenue.
- Lewis, Mrs. Bransford, Lindell and Newstead avenues, Lindell Avenue Methodist Episcopal Church.

- Lindquist, Rev. J. Alb., 307 Atlanta avenue, Pastor Swedish Evangelical Congregational Church.
- Linn, Rev. Paul H., 3676 Cook avenue, Scruggs Memorial Methodist Episcopal Church, South.
- Lionberger, Isaac, 37 Westmoreland place, appointed by the Mayor, representing Princeton University.
- Lloyd, Hiram, 803 Odd Fellows' Bldg., Business Men's League.
- Logue, Thomas, 3743 W. Pine boulevard, St. Francis Xavier's Church.
- Long, C. C., 5925 Cote Brilliante avenue, West Park Baptist Church.
- Love, Edward K., President, E. K. Love Realty Co., Business Men's League.
- Lowes, John L., Ph. D., Washington University.
- Luyties, F. August, 3861 Laclede avenue, Business Men's League.
- Lyon, Elias P., 4326 Forest Park boulevard, St. Louis University.
- MacLay, W. D., 4604 Olive street, Seventh Day Adventist Church.
- McCabe, James J., 2336 University street, Church of the Sacred Heart.
- McCann, Miss Carrie, 6641 Vermont avenue, Carondelet Methodist Episcopal Church, South.
- McCann, Miss Floy, 6641 Vermont avenue, Carondelet Methodist Episcopal Church, South.
- McCann, Z. T., 6641 Vermont avenue, Carondelet Methodist Episcopal Church South.
- McCarthy, Rev. John, 4877 Cote Brilliante avenue, Pastor Wagoner Place Methodist Church.
- McCarthy, Joseph, M. D., 3805 Westminster place, St. Francis Xavier's Church.
- McCreary, Rev. L. W., 5943 Woodland place, Pastor Hamilton Avenue Christian Church.
- McDonald, Hon. Jesse, St. Louis University.
- McFaden, Mrs. Mildred S., 2807 Locust street, American Woman's Republic.
- McGinnis, Dr. C. Q., 4257 Meramec street, Christian Memorial Church.
- McMillen, Rev. Walter F., Lafayette Park Presbyterian Church, Westminster College.
- McNair, Lilburn G., Eighth and Locust streets, appointed by the Mayor.
- McNair, Miss Louise, 4296 Washington avenue, Wellesley College.
- Maffitt, Thomas S., 518 Security Bldg., Business Men's League.
- Magill, Mrs. Frank H., 6531 Joseph avenue, National Woman's Christian Temperance Union.
- Magill, Rev. Frank H., 6531 Joseph avenue, Oak Hill Presbyterian Church.
- Mangold, Dr. George B., 4002 Lexington avenue, North Presbyterian Church.
- Mark, H., 3142 Leola street, Immanuel Congregational Church.
- Markham, George D., 4961 Berlin avenue, representing the American Society for the Judicial Settlement of International Disputes, and Harvard University.

- Masker, Rev. W. A. Jr., 1445 East Grand avenue, St. Alban's Episcopal Church.
- Mauldin, T. L., 345 W. Gate avenue, University Methodist Church.
- Mauze, Rev. J. Layton, 5528 Cates avenue, Central Presbyterian Church.
- May, Mrs. Lettie H., 5162 Cates avenue, W. C. T. U. Department of Peace and International Arbitration.
- Mayfield, W. H., M. D., 920 N. Taylor avenue, Vice-President Will Mayfield College.
- Meeker, Jacob E., 1911 Longfellow boulevard, appointed by the Mayor.
- Mellow, T., 6626 Alabama avenue, Carondelet Methodist Episcopal Church.
- Meyer, Albert, 3206 Barrett street, Fourth Christian Church.
- Meyer, Lewis, 4857 St. Louis avenue, German Methodist Episcopal Church.
- Meyer, Ferd. P., 3046 Hawthorne boulevard, Church of the Immaculate Conception.
- Miller, James G., Commonwealth Trust Bldg., Business Men's League.
- Miller, L. B., 3749 Laclede avenue, First Christian Church.
- Minyard, Rev. Thos. A., 2726 Limit avenue, Maplewood Christian Church.
- Minyard, Mrs. Thomas A., 2726 Limit avenue, Maplewood Christian Church.
- Mitchell, John E., 6205 Simpson avenue, Clifton Heights Christian Church.
- Mocker, J. F., 1909 St. Louis avenue, North Side Y. M. C. A.
- Mohorter, Rev. James H., 5926 Ridge avenue, Hammett Place Christian Church.
- Moon, J. C., Gano and McKissock avenues, Business Men's League.
- Moore, J. Edward, Superintendent Missouri Anti-Saloon League, University of Puget Sound.
- Moore, Dr. Eleanora, Victoria Bldg., American Woman's Republic.
- Moore, Mrs. Philip N., 3125 Lafayette avenue, representing the Woman's International Peace League of America, and Vassar College.
- Moore, Judge W. D., 4006 Chouteau avenue, Wagoner Memorial Methodist Episcopal Church.
- Moorehead, Rev. John H., 4466 McPherson avenue, First United Presbyterian Church.
- More, Edward A., 3144 N. Broadway, Business Men's League.
- Moreland, Mrs. S. M., Baden Station, Bellefontaine Methodist Episcopal Church, South.
- Murch, G. H., 4017 Peck street, Fourth Baptist Church.
- Nagel, Charles, Security Bldg., appointed by the Mayor, Business Men's League.
- Nay, Dr. A., 4249 Morgan street, Delmar Avenue Baptist Church.

Nelson, Mrs. Lillian, 4254 Orchard street, American Woman's Republic.
 Niccolls, Rev. Dr. S. J., 8 Hortense place, Church Federation of St. Louis.
 Nisson, Rev. Niel, 6807 Hancock avenue, Immanuel Congregational Church.

Nisson, Mrs. Niel, 6807 Hancock avenue, Immanuel Congregational Church.

Noble, Thomas, Twelfth and Brooklyn streets, Twentieth Century Club.
 Norton, Rev. Geo. E., 6016 Waterman avenue, Pastor of St. Michael and All Angels Church.

Norvell, Saunders, 9 Kingsbury place, appointed by the Mayor, Business Men's League.

Nugent, Mrs. J. G., 5847 Maple avenue, National Congress of Mothers' and Parent-Teachers' Association, Missouri Branch.

Obear, W. F., 25 N. Second street, Compton Hill Congregational Church.
 O'Fallon, Charles P., Commonwealth Trust Bldg., Business Men's League.

O'Leary, Daniel, 6819 Pennsylvania avenue, Sts. Mary and Joseph Church.

Osthaus, Leo, 3536 Pestalozzi street, North American Gymnastic Union.
 Otting, Rev. B. J., S. J., Catholic Archdiocese of St. Louis, appointed by the Archbishop.

Ottoby, Dr. L. M., 5228 Vernon avenue, appointed by the Mayor.

Palmquist, 3000 St. Vincent avenue, Gethsemane Swedish Lutheran Church.

Panhut, F., 2309 Illinois avenue, Ebenezer German Church.

Parker, H. L., President, Emerson Electric Co., Business Men's League.

Parker, John C., 213 Market street, Business Men's League.

Paxson, Judge A. A., Pierce Bldg., St. Mark's English Evangelical Lutheran Church.

Peal, Rev. Elmer, 5947 Cote Brilliance avenue, Mt. Auburn Methodist Church.

Pearcy, C. O., 4126 Connecticut street, St. Luke's Methodist Episcopal Church.

Peper, Mrs. C. B., 5296 Westminster place, the International Order of the King's Daughters and Sons.

Perkins, Miss Perla Jackson, 3899 Washington boulevard, appointed by the Mayor.

Perry, Mary E., Buckingham Hotel, appointed by the Mayor.

Peters, J. Fred, 6220 Berthold avenue, Maple Avenue Reformed Church.

Pettes, Henry, 4120 Peck street, Holy Cross House.

Phillips, Alroy S., 5665 Cates avenue, appointed by the Mayor.

Pollard, Wm. J., Excise Office, appointed by the Mayor.

Preetorius, Edward L., President, German-American Press Association, Business Men's League, appointed by the Mayor.

Probst, Otto, 1910 N. Fourteenth street, Second Christian Church.

Pulitzer, Joseph, Jr., St. Louis Post-Dispatch, appointed by the Mayor.

- Punsky, W. L., 3650 Shaw avenue, Compton Hill Congregational Church.
- Putnam, Florence L., 6109 Waterman avenue, First Presbyterian Church.
- Quinn, John B., 1407 Goodfellow avenue, Christian Brothers' College.
- Rake, Rev. J. F., 1363 Euclid avenue, Pastor of Euclid Avenue Baptist Church.
- Rathmann, C. G., 912 Locust street, North American Gymnastic Union.
- Ray, E. Lansing, Globe-Democrat, Business Men's League.
- Reis, Chas. E., 5812 Michigan avenue, Sts. Mary and Joseph Church.
- Rhodes, Rev. M., 4414 Washington boulevard, Pastor St. Mark's English Evangelical Lutheran Church.
- Rice, Herman, Famous and Barr Company, Tabernacle Baptist Church.
- Robbins, E. C., Buckingham Hotel, Amherst College.
- Robbins, Rev. Dr. Grant A., Garrison and Lucas avenues, Union Methodist Church.
- Roberts, John C., 1501 Washington avenue, Business Men's League.
- Roberts, Mrs. Mamie, 3528 Henrietta street, Compton Heights Baptist Church.
- Robroch, H. B., 1317 Sullivan avenue, Salem Reformed Church.
- Rodgers, Dr. F. C., 5086 Westminster place, St. Louis University.
- Roemer, Rev. J. L., 3650 Flad avenue, Pastor of Tyler Place Presbyterian Church.
- Roth, J. H., 621 Kansas street, Seventh Day Adventists.
- Rumbold, Miss Charlotte, 5903 Von Versen avenue, appointed by the Mayor.
- Russell, Rev. Dr. Francis W., 5848 Maple avenue, Pastor of West Presbyterian Church.
- Russell, Mrs. F. W., 5848 Maple avenue, Vassar College.
- Russell, Rev. R. L., 4158 Cleveland avenue, Pastor of Compton Hill Congregational Church.
- Ryan, Hon. O'Neill, St. Louis University.
- Sale, Rabbi Samuel, 4621 Westminster place, appointed by the Mayor.
- Saxl, Dr. Ernst, Metropolitan Bldg., Missouri Peace Society.
- Scammell, H. B., 4568 Washington boulevard, Second Baptist Church.
- Scharr, J. J., 7218 Old Manchester road, Christ Evangelical Church.
- Schelp, Walter F., 4148 W. Belle place, Salem Methodist Episcopal Church.
- Scherr, H. F., 6972 Pernod avenue, Immanuel Congregational Church.
- Schmoll, John H., 3626 Utah place, appointed by the Mayor.
- Schotten, Julius J., 300 S. Broadway, Business Men's League.
- Schultze, W. C., Pastor Memorial Methodist Episcopal Church.
- Scott, Oreon E., 817 Chestnut street, Union Avenue Christian Church.
- Segerhammar, Rev. Carl J., Pastor of Gethsemane Swedish Lutheran Church.
- Selph, Colin M., appointed by the Mayor, President of the Million Population Club.

- Senter, Chas. P., Third and Walnut streets, Third Baptist Church.
- Shapleigh, A. L., appointed by the Mayor, President of the Business Men's League.
- Shea, Rev. E. J., 1511 Pennsylvania avenue, Rector of Church of the Immaculate Conception.
- Shelton, Mrs. Theodore, 4467 Lindell boulevard, Missouri Daughters of the American Revolution.
- Shields, Judge George H., Westminster College.
- Shelby, B. A., 5295 Waterman avenue, St. Louis Manufacturers' and Exporters' Association.
- Shoemaker, Mrs. J. F., 4499 Lindell boulevard, Lindell Avenue Methodist Episcopal Church.
- Siebert, Dr. A., 3770 Flad avenue, National Congress of Mothers and Parent-Teachers' Association, Missouri Branch.
- Simon, Dr. Emil, 2623 Lemp avenue, North American Gymnastic Union.
- Simon, Dr. John H., 1201 McCausland avenue, appointed by the Mayor.
- Sixtus, Rev. Brother Lawrence, Christian Brothers' College.
- Slack, B. L., 4350 Morgan street, St. Mark's English Evangelical Lutheran Church.
- Smith, Mrs. Henry, 5581 Cabanne avenue, appointed by the Mayor.
- Smith, Luther Ely, Pierce Bldg., Amherst College.
- Smith, Rev. William, 6438 Wise avenue, Pastor of Memorial Congregational Church.
- Spicer, Wm., 1731 N. Twelfth street, Second Christian Church.
- Spooner, E. H., 4397 Forest Park boulevard, Business Men's League.
- Stanard, W. K., 1015 Pierce Building, Business Men's League.
- Standley, Col. D. S., 21 Washington terrace, Central Presbyterian Church.
- Starkloff, Dr. Max, 3623 Cleveland avenue, North American Gymnastic Union.
- Stephens, Lon V., former Governor of Missouri, 5836 Cabanne avenue, appointed by the Governor.
- Stevens, J. J., 5800 Pennsylvania avenue, Dover Place Christian Church.
- Stewart, A. C., 5727 Cabanne avenue, appointed by the Mayor.
- Stickel, Charles, Grand and Juniata, appointed by the Mayor.
- Stickney, A. T., 209 N. Fourth street, Business Men's League.
- Stifel, Otto F., President of Union Brewing Co., Business Men's League.
- Stix, Hon. Charles A., Grand Leader, appointed by the Mayor.
- Stoner, Stanley, 608-609 Security Bldg., Cornell University.
- Strodtman, George W., 4407 N. Twenty-first, St. Alban's Chapel.
- Sutherland, G. W., 3815 Botanical avenue, Tyler Place Presbyterian Church.
- Sutter, Charles, 1220 Pine street, appointed by the Mayor.
- Tannrath, Rev. John J., Pastor St. Agnes' Church.
- Tallon, Rev. T. W., 4515 Evans avenue, Catholic Archdiocese of St. Louis, appointed by the Archbishop.

- Taussig, William, 3447 Lafayette avenue, Business Men's League.
- Teasdale, J. W., 38 Kingsbury place, Third Baptist Church.
- Tevis, Hupp, 5085 Cabanne avenue, Fountain Park Congregational Church.
- Thomson, John J., 2715 N. Sarah street, Christian Brothers' College.
- Thornton, Francis A., St. Louis University.
- Tierney, John L., 3670 W. Pine boulevard, Visitor.
- Todd, Rev. A. A., 2140 Allen avenue, Lafayette Park Baptist Church.
- Toeppen, Dr. H., 1813 Lami street, North American Gymnastic Union.
- Tolan, Cecilia, 5559 Waterman avenue, Mt. Auburn Methodist Church.
- Toomey, Mrs. P. J., 4035 Morgan street, the National Council of the Society of the Queen's Daughters.
- Tremayne, J. W., 6758 Garner avenue, Immanuel Methodist Church.
- Tucker, Mrs. Margaret, 5601 Delmar avenue, National Arbitration Society.
- Tunnell, Rev. C. S., 7202 Pennsylvania avenue, Carondelet Baptist Church.
- Tuttle, Bishop Daniel S., 74 Vandeventer place, appointed by the Governor.
- Urbauer, H. F., 106 S. Twelfth street, Business Men's League.
- Usher, Roland G., Ph. D., 5737 Cates avenue, Washington University.
- Varwig, Rev. J. W., 7117 Manchester avenue, Christ Evangelical Church.
- Vater, Rev. W. D., 4004 Lexington avenue, Pastor of North Presbyterian Church.
- Veninga, F. W., M. D., 3407 S. Jefferson avenue, Nuelsen Methodist Episcopal Church.
- Vierling, Frederick, 6205 Waterman avenue, University Methodist Church.
- Von Drehle, D. B. F., Church of Our Redeemer.
- Wade, Festus J., 4461 Lindell boulevard, appointed by the Mayor, Business Men's League.
- Wagenman, Mrs. Albert J., 3628 Washington boulevard, the International Order of the King's Daughters and Sons.
- Wagner, Hugh Kiernan, 503 Fullerton Bldg., appointed by the Mayor, Million Population Club.
- Wagoner, Mrs. Jewett, 1701 Wagoner place, Wagoner Place Methodist Church.
- Walbridge, C. P., Fourth and Market streets, Business Men's League.
- Waldmann, Mrs. Lydia, 4009 Russell avenue, German Evangelical Bethlehem Church.
- Waldmann, Rev. Otto, 4009 Russell avenue, Pastor German Evangelical Bethlehem Church.
- Waldo, Prof. C. A., Washington University.
- Walker, D. D., Jr., Sixteenth street and Washington avenue, Business Men's League.
- Wallace, J. T., 613 Wainwright Bldg., Business Men's League.

- Wallace, Rev. Thomas F., St. Louis University.
- Warren, Frederick B., St. Louis Star, appointed by the Mayor.
- Warren, Mrs. William, 5226 Von Versen avenue, appointed by the Mayor.
- Waterhouse, Dr. E. R., 1011 Dillon street, appointed by the Mayor.
- Weaver, Alva, Seventh street and Shenandoah avenue, Tabernacle Baptist Church.
- Webster, Thomas M., 5146 Vernon avenue, Kingshighway Presbyterian Church.
- Weeks, Rev. B. D., 3641 Russell avenue, Pastor of Compton Heights Baptist Church.
- Wells, Erastus, 509 Olive street, Business Men's League.
- Wenneker, C. F., 5333 Berlin avenue, Manufacturers' and Exporters' Association.
- Wenzlick, Albert, 1010 Chestnut street, Tyler Place Presbyterian Church.
- West, Thos. H., 11 Westmoreland place, American Bankers' Association.
- Westhus, Ben., 2001 S. Broadway, appointed by the Mayor.
- Whelan, Harry G., 3520 Vista avenue, Church of the Immaculate Conception.
- Whitehill, Thomas H., 5016 Von Versen avenue, Fountain Park Congregational Church.
- Whittemore, Mrs. Clinton, 18 Lenox place, St. Michael's and All Angels' Church.
- Whittlesey, James W., 514 West End place, Missouri Division of the International Sunshine Society.
- Wichmann, Dr. Herman, 3229 S. Jefferson avenue, appointed by the Mayor.
- Widmann, Frederick, 3545 Longfellow boulevard, Nord Amerikanischer Turnerbund.
- Wiegand, George, 2000 N. Broadway, Business Men's League.
- Wieggers, Frank, 2150 Victor street, St. Agnes' Church.
- Williams, R. P., Third National Bank Bldg., Trinity Presbyterian Church.
- Williamson, Rev. W. J., Windermere Hotel, appointed by the Mayor, Third Baptist Church.
- Wilson, George W., St. Louis University.
- Wilson, S. G., Twelfth and Washington avenue, Business Men's League.
- Winter, Ernst G., 3711 S. Broadway, St. Louis Gymnastic Society.
- Witte, F. A., 704-6 N. Third street, Business Men's League.
- Woitchek, Emil G., 3451 Sidney street, Memorial Methodist Episcopal Church.
- Wood, Mrs. C. A., 7250 Maple boulevard, Immanuel Methodist Church.
- Woodrow, Rev. S. H., Pastor Pilgrim Congregational Church, Washington Peace Society.
- Wray, A. K., 3911 Blair avenue, Pastor of Hyde Park Congregational Church.

Wright, Mrs. C. G., 6846 Clayton avenue, Memorial Congregational Church.

Wright, John, 1408 Hamilton avenue, West Presbyterian Church.

Wright, William F., 6137 Columbia avenue, Methodist Episcopal Church.

Wyard, Mrs. A. F., 5967 Cote Brillante avenue, West Park Baptist Church.

Young, Allyn A., Ph. D., Washington University.

MONTANA.

Brooks, Mrs. Geo. F., Missoula, appointed by the Governor.

Brooks, Mrs. Randolph, Bozeman, appointed by the Governor.

Campbell, C. H., Great Falls, appointed by the Governor.

Christler, Rev. L. J., Havre, appointed by the Governor.

Lane, J. A., Lewistown, appointed by the Governor.

Lynch, James H., Butte, appointed by the Governor.

Miles, George M., Miles City, appointed by the Governor.

Powell, J. G., Billings, appointed by the Governor.

Sloan, Rev. W. N., Helena, appointed by the Governor.

Whipps, W. C., Kalispell, appointed by the Governor.

NEBRASKA.

Andrews, Dr. E. Benjamin, Lincoln, the American Peace and Arbitration League.

Avery, Samuel, Chancellor of the University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Commercial Club and Nebraska Peace Society.

Aylsworth, L. E., University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Nebraska Peace Society.

Brown, J. S., Crete, Nebraska Peace Society.

Burkett, Hon. E. J., former United States Senator, Lincoln, Commercial Club.

Fling, Dr. F. M., University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Nebraska Peace Society.

Frost, Judge, Lincoln, Lincoln Commercial Club.

Jones, Will Owen, Editor Nebraska State Journal, Lincoln, Commercial Club.

Love, Don L., Little Block, Lincoln, Nebraska Peace Society.

Weatherly, A. L., Pastor All Souls' Church, Lincoln, Commercial Club and Nebraska Peace Society.

Wilson, V. E., Stromberg, Nebraska Peace Society.

NEW HAMPSHIRE.

Pillsbury, Leonard H., Derry, appointed by the Governor, also representing the New Hampshire Peace Society, the Derry Peace Society, G. A. R. Post 41, and Baptist Church of Derry.

Plummer, Mrs. William A., Laconia, New Hampshire Federation of Women's Clubs.

NEW JERSEY.

- Hill, E. C., 7 W. State street, Trenton, Chamber of Commerce.
 Ingersoll, C. H., 315 Fourth avenue, New York City, Trenton, Chamber of Commerce.
 Metzger, C. Arthur, Secretary Chamber of Commerce, Trenton.
 Wetzel, Dr. William A., Belmont Circle, Trenton, Chamber of Commerce.
 Wood, Hon. Ira W., 138 E. State street, Trenton, Chamber of Commerce.

NEW MEXICO.

- Collins, Mrs. Lorin C., Santa Fe, New Mexico Federation of Women's Clubs.
 Crile, Rev. Austin D., Roswell, Pastor Trinity Lutheran Church and Chaplain of the New Mexico Military Institute, appointed by the Governor.
 Hadley, Hiram, Mesilla Park, appointed by the Governor.
 Hagerman, Mrs. Anna O., Roswell, New Mexico Federation of Women's Clubs.
 Joyce, John R., Carlsbad, appointed by the Governor.
 Mandalari, Rev. A. M., Albuquerque, appointed by the Governor.
 McBride, Mrs. Minnie, Lake Arthur, New Mexico Federation of Women's Clubs.
 O'Brien, Thos. J., Dawson, appointed by the Governor.
 Pace, John A., Clayton, appointed by the Governor.
 Prince, L. Bradford, Santa Fe., appointed by the Governor.
 Raynolds, Jefferson, Las Vegas, appointed by the Governor.
 Tittman, Edward T., Hillsboro, appointed by the Governor.
 White, Mrs. L. E., Aztec, New Mexico Federation of Women's Clubs.
 Whited, Mrs. C. A., Raton, New Mexico Federation of Women's Clubs.

NEW YORK.

- Almy, Francis, Buffalo, the Peace and Arbitration Society of Buffalo.
 Black, Mrs. Elmer, 512 Fifth avenue, New York, appointed by the Governor, by Mayor Gaynor, also representing the Church Peace League and the American Peace and Arbitration League.
 Blair, Mrs. Elmer, 445 Western avenue, Albany, New York Federation of Women's Clubs.
 Carnegie, Andrew, 2 East Ninety-first street, New York, representing the American Committee for the Celebration of the One Hundredth Anniversary of Peace Among English Speaking Nations, also the New York Peace Society.
 Dale, Francis C., 54 W. Fortieth street, New York, the American Peace and Arbitration League.
 Davenport, Mrs. Esther C., 292 Fifteenth street, Buffalo, New York Federation of Women's Clubs.

Duras, Victor Hugo, 500 Broadway, New York, National Arbitration Society.

Grant, Mrs. Eugene J., 379 Washington avenue, Brooklyn, New York Federation of Women's Clubs.

Haight, Hon. Albert, Buffalo, the Peace and Arbitration Society of Buffalo.

Hammond, John Hays, New York, the International Peace Forum.

Hay, Miss Mary Garrett, 2 W. Eighty-sixth street, New York, New York Federation of Women's Clubs.

Helmuth, Mrs. William Tod, 302 Central Park West, New York, New York Federation of Women's Clubs.

Holt, Hamilton, 130 Fulton street, New York, appointed by the Mayor.

Hill, John Wesley, New York City, President of the International Peace Forum.

Humphrey, Andrew B., 54 W. Fortieth street, New York, representing the American Committee for One Hundredth Anniversary of Peace Among English Speaking Nations, General Secretary of American Peace and Arbitration League, appointed by the Governor and by the Mayor.

Hunsberger, Dr. W. A., Executive Vice-President, International Peace Forum, 185 Madison avenue, New York.

Mackin, Countess Spottiswood, 784 Park avenue, New York, appointed by the Governor.

Marks, Marcus M., 29 W. Forty-second street, New York, appointed by the Mayor.

Noble, Pearl, 200 W. Seventy-second street, New York, New York Peace Society.

Olmstead, Hon. John B., Buffalo, the Peace and Arbitration Society of Buffalo.

Percy, H. Carolyn, 21 Hoosick street, Hoosick Falls, Peace Society, Wellesley College.

Peters, Rev. Madison C., 1822 Glenwood road, Brooklyn, Chairman of Educational Department of the American Peace and Arbitration League.

Richard, Dr. Ernst, 12 W. One Hundred and Third street, New York, German-American Peace Society, New York Peace Society.

Willcox, Ansley, Buffalo, the Peace and Arbitration Society of Buffalo.

Williams, Frank F., Buffalo, the Peace and Arbitration Society of Buffalo.

Wilson, Gen. James Grant, New York City, Vice-President American Peace and Arbitration League, Chairman of Delegation of Six Members, appointed by the Mayor.

NORTH CAROLINA.

Clarkson, Heriot, Charlotte, appointed by the Mayor.

Latta, E. D., Jr., Charlotte, appointed by the Mayor.

Preston, E. R., Charlotte, appointed by the Mayor.
 Sifford, R. J., Charlotte, appointed by the Mayor.
 Wilkes, J. Frank, Charlotte, appointed by the Mayor.

NORTH DAKOTA.

Baldwin, Hon. Abram, Oberon, appointed by the Governor.
 Carr, Mrs. Andrew, Minot, North Dakota Federation of Women's Clubs.
 Crawford, Lewis F., Sentinel, Butte, appointed by the Governor.
 Fontana, Rev. John, New Salem, appointed by the Governor.
 Glenn, Rev. H. J., Grafton, appointed by the Governor.
 Grant, Hon. A. D., Jamestown, appointed by the Governor.
 Kroeze, Dr. B. H., Jamestown, appointed by the Governor.
 Larson, Rev. J. Edor, Gwinner, appointed by the Governor.
 Mann, Bishop Cameron, Fargo, appointed by the Governor.
 McVey, Mrs. Frank L., University of North Dakota, Grand Forks, North Dakota Federation of Women's Clubs.
 McVey, Frank L., President of University of North Dakota, Grand Forks.
 Neilson, Miss Minnie Jean, Valley City, President North Dakota Federation of Women's Clubs.
 O'Reilly, Rt. Rev. James, Fargo, appointed by the Governor.
 Perinton, Rev. O. D., Cooperstown, appointed by the Governor.
 Pillyer, Mrs. Thomas, Mayville, North Dakota Federation of Women's Clubs.
 Robertson, Dr. E. P., Grand Forks, appointed by the Governor.
 Shepard, Mrs. J. P., Fargo, North Dakota Federation of Women's Clubs.
 Taylor, Mrs. E. J., Bismarck, North Dakota Federation of Women's Clubs.
 Wehrle, Rt. Rev. Vincent, Bismarck, appointed by the Governor.
 White, Hon. Alfred, Dickinson, appointed by the Governor.
 Winter, W. F., Langdon, appointed by the Governor.

OHIO.

Beale, Mrs. Clark, Mt. Sterling, Ohio Daughters of the American Revolution.
 Bradley, Rev. Dan. F., 2905 W. Fourteenth street, Cleveland, appointed by the Mayor.
 Brenner, Harry, Springfield, appointed by the Mayor.
 Conger, Mrs. A. L., Irving Lawn, Akron, Ohio Daughters of the American Revolution.
 Constantine, Charles, Springfield, appointed by the Mayor.
 Cook, William, Springfield, appointed by the Mayor.
 Currier, S. D., Youngstown, appointed by the Mayor.
 Dubois, Rev. G. W., 583 Considine avenue, Cincinnati, Arbitration and Peace Society.

Eversman, Mrs. Walter A., 624 Acklin avenue, Toledo, Ohio Daughters of the American Revolution.

Gilkey, Rev. S. W., Pastor of United Presbyterian Church, New Concord.
Gries, Rabbi Moses J., Lake Shore boulevard, Cleveland, appointed by the Mayor.

Kelly, George E., Springfield, appointed by the Mayor.

Laylin, Mrs. L. C., The Portland, Washington, D. C., representing the Ohio Daughters of the American Revolution.

Meacham, D. B., Cincinnati, President of the Arbitration and Peace Society.

Myers, Philip Van Ness, Cincinnati, Cincinnati Peace and Arbitration Society.

Rogers, William P., Cincinnati, Business Men's Club and Arbitration and Peace Society.

Schmidlapp, J. G., Cincinnati, appointed by the Governor, the Mayor, American Bankers' Association, the Chamber of Commerce.

Simon, Rev. M. O., 1867 Crawford road, Cleveland, appointed by the Mayor.

Snyder, David F., Springfield, appointed by the Mayor.

Thwing, Charles F., President of Western Reserve University, Cleveland, appointed by the Mayor, representing the Cleveland Peace Society.

Truesdall, Mrs. Clayton R., Birchaw avenue, Fremont, Ohio Daughters of the American Revolution.

Van Kirk, J. W., 1314 Shehy street, Youngstown, appointed by the Mayor, Youngstown Peace Society.

Weston, Prof. S. F., Yellow Springs, the Intercollegiate Peace Association.

OKLAHOMA

Atwood, Mrs. Weston, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma Federation of Women's Clubs.

Bobo, Mrs. C. S., Norman, Oklahoma Federation of Women's Clubs.

Brett, R., Cordell, appointed by the Governor.

Dowd, Jerome, Norman, appointed by the Governor.

Downing, R. E., Pawhuskie, appointed by the Governor.

Ferguson, Walter, Cherokee, appointed by the Governor.

Geissler, Mrs. Arthur H., 432 W. Twelfth street, Oklahoma City, appointed by the Governor.

Halsell, Hon. R. R., Calera, appointed by the Governor

Hillerman, Mrs. P. P., Sapulpa, Oklahoma Federation of Women's Clubs.

Horner, C. G., Guthrie, appointed by the Governor.

Johnston, Mrs. C. O., Durant, Oklahoma Federation of Women's Clubs.

McClintic, Miss Olive, Chickasha, Oklahoma Federation of Women's Clubs.

McCutchan, Joseph E., Pawnee, appointed by the Governor.

McDougal, Mrs. D. A., Sapulpa, Oklahoma Federation of Women's Clubs.

Offield, Mrs. J. M., Kendall place, Muskogee, Oklahoma Federation of Women's Clubs, appointed by the Commercial Club.

Pack, W. J., Muskogee, appointed by the Governor.

Phippen, Mrs. U. G., Hugo, Oklahoma Federation of Women's Clubs.

Porter, Mrs. Franklin, Muskogee, Oklahoma Federation of Women's Clubs.

Scherubel, Mrs. Fred, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma Federation of Women's Clubs.

Smith, Mrs. C. C., Enid, Oklahoma Federation of Women's Clubs.

Southard, Mrs. George, Enid, Oklahoma Federation of Women's Clubs.

Vinson, A. G., Alva, appointed by the Governor.

OREGON.

Breyman, Mrs. A. H., 582 Myrtle street, Portland, Oregon Federation of Women's Clubs.

Kerr, Mrs. W. J., Corvallis, Oregon Federation of Women's Clubs.

Logan, Mrs. Mary L., The Dalles, Oregon Federation of Women's Clubs.

Reed, Mrs. Herbert G. N., 125 E. Eighty-third street, North Portland, Oregon Federation of Women's Clubs.

Todd, Mrs. Allen, 591 E. Twentieth street, North Portland, Oregon Federation of Women's Clubs.

PENNSYLVANIA.

Bailey, Joshua L., Wynnewood, the Philadelphia Peace Association of Friends.

Blankenburg, Mrs. Rudolph, West Logan Square, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania Federation of Women's Clubs.

Cadwallader, John, 1411 Locust street, Philadelphia, appointed by the Governor.

Cadwallader, J. Augustus, 1000 Bailey Bldg, Philadelphia, Executive Secretary of Pennsylvania Arbitration and Peace Society.

Chamberlain, Mrs. James I., Harrisburg, Pennsylvania Federation of Women's Clubs.

Church, S. H., Pittsburg, Board of Trustees of Carnegie Institute, also the Pennsylvania Arbitration and Peace Society and University of Pittsburg.

Conwell, Dr. Russell, Temple University, Philadelphia, appointed by the Governor.

Farquhar, A. B., York, Pennsylvania Arbitration and Peace Society, American Peace Society, Chamber of Commerce, National Association of Manufacturers.

Harrison, Charles C., Devon, appointed by the Governor.

Hull, William I., Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, Pennsylvania Arbitration and Peace Society.

Hull, Mrs. William I., Swarthmore, Pennsylvania Federation of Women's Clubs.

Levy, Dr. J. Leonard, Pittsburg, University of Pittsburg, appointed by the Governor.

Linder, John, Carlisle, appointed by the Governor.

McCook, Willis, Pittsburg, appointed by the Governor.

McCormick, S. B., Chancellor of the University of Pittsburg, Pittsburg.

Osborne, Louis Allen, Scranton, representing the Navy League of the United States.

Prout, Col. H. G., Pittsburg, University of Pittsburg.

Raugh, Mrs. Enoch, 5837 Bartlett street, Pittsburg, Pennsylvania Federation of Women's Clubs.

Smith, Lee S., Pittsburg, University of Pittsburg.

Steere, Florence T., Haveford, the Philadelphia Peace Association of Friends.

Taylor, Francis R., 918 Stephen Girard Bldg., Philadelphia, Pennsylvania Arbitration and Peace Society, also Philadelphia Peace Association of Friends.

Thaw, Mrs. William, Jr., 930 Lynedale avenue, N. S. Pittsburg, Pennsylvania Federation of Women's Clubs.

Warfield, Dr. E. D., President Lafayette College, Easton, appointed by the Governor.

RHODE ISLAND.

Arnold, Mrs. John M., Crompton, Rhode Island Federation of Women's Clubs.

Clarke, Mrs. Elisha D., Woodland road, Woonsocket, Rhode Island Federation of Women's Clubs.

Fowler, Mrs. George F., 72 Mineral Spring avenue, Pawtucket, Rhode Island Federation of Women's Clubs.

Irons, Mrs. Walter Stokes, 35 Humboldt avenue, Providence, Rhode Island Federation of Women's Clubs.

Kilton, Mrs. George A., 2069 Broad street, Edgewood, Rhode Island Federation of Women's Clubs.

SOUTH CAROLINA.

Budds, Rev. J. D., Charleston, appointed by the Governor.

Delano, Rev. George S., Mountville, appointed by the Governor.

Freed, C. A., 1301 Richland street, Columbia, appointed by the Governor.

Holler, A. E., Clio, appointed by the Governor.

Hallman, Rev. S. T., Spartanburg, appointed by the Governor.

Hemrick, Rev. N. A., Newberry, appointed by the Governor.

Jacobs, Rev. W. P., Clinton, appointed by the Governor.

Mitchell, Samuel C., President of University of South Carolina, Columbia.

Moffatt, Rev. J. S., Due West, appointed by the Governor.

Pitts, Rev. J. D., Blackville, appointed by the Governor.

Poynor, Rev. Wilmost S., Columbia, appointed by the Governor.
 Rudds, Rev. J. D., Charleston, appointed by the Governor.
 Wolling, Rev. J. A., Allendale, appointed by the Governor.

SOUTH DAKOTA.

Angell, R. H., Aberdeen, appointed by the Mayor.
 Billingshurst, Mrs. Mary B., Pierre, South Dakota Federation of Women's Clubs.
 Brown, Ralph L., Aberdeen, appointed by the Mayor.
 Dent, Rev. T. J., Aberdeen, appointed by the Mayor.
 Dolliver, Mrs. R. H., Hot Springs, South Dakota Federation of Women's Clubs and Mothers' Club of Hot Springs.
 Ferris, Mrs. Mamie, Watertown, South Dakota Federation of Women's Clubs.
 Herried, C. N., Aberdeen, appointed by the Mayor.
 Puckett, Mrs. Madge A., Canton, South Dakota Federation of Women's Clubs.
 Roberts, Mrs. W. J., Hot Springs, South Dakota Federation of Women's Clubs.
 Rolfe, Mrs. Lillian, Flandreau, South Dakota Federation of Women's Clubs.
 Russell, Mrs. S. W., Deadwood, South Dakota Federation of Women's Clubs.
 Williamson, Ray, Aberdeen, appointed by the Mayor.

TENNESSEE.

Allen, Terry W., Elks Bldg., Jackson, appointed by the Mayor
 Gardner, Mrs. V. M., Martin, Tennessee Federation of Women's Clubs.
 Gill, Miss Laura Drake, Sewanee.
 Gleason, Rev. P. J., Nashville, appointed by the Mayor.
 Hoepfner, Theodore, 136 S. Second street, Memphis, appointed by the Mayor.
 Jackson, Mrs. Robert F., 1922 West End avenue, Nashville, Tennessee Federation of Women's Clubs.
 Kirby-Smith, Mrs. R. M., Sewanee, Tennessee Federation of Women's Clubs.
 Kirkland, J. H., Chancellor of Vanderbilt University, Nashville.
 Kirkland, Mrs. James H., Nashville, Tennessee Federation of Women's Clubs.
 Lewinthal, Rev. Isadore, Nashville, appointed by the Mayor.
 Logan, Dr. Mercer P., 421 Woodland street, Nashville, appointed by the Mayor.
 Lowenstein, Elias, Memphis, appointed by the Mayor.
 Maury, Dr. R. B., Memphis Trust Bldg., Memphis, appointed by the Mayor.

Smith, Bolton, 66 Madison avenue, Memphis, appointed by the Mayor, representing the Business Men's Club, and George Peabody College for Teachers.

Tolman, Dr. H. C., Nashville, appointed by the Mayor.

Vance, Rev. James I., Nashville, appointed by the Mayor.

Winslow, Mrs. H. M., Harriman, Tennessee Federation of Women's Clubs.

Young, Judge J. P., Memphis, appointed by the Mayor.

TEXAS.

Brooks, Judge S. J., San Antonio, appointed by the Mayor.

Burkhalter, Frank E., Waco, Baylor University.

Chamberlain, Edwin, San Antonio, appointed by the Mayor.

Christensen, Mrs. Mary L., 1605 Ninth street, Wichita Falls, Texas Federation of Women's Clubs.

Connally, Hon. Tom, Marlin, Baylor University.

Connor, W. B., Paris, appointed by the Mayor.

Culbertson, J. J., Paris, appointed by the Mayor.

Fay, Prof. E. W., Austin, University of Texas.

Flournoy, Representative John W., Beeville, appointed by the Governor.

Garrett, Dr. Alexander, Springtown, appointed by the Governor.

Gates, I. E., Plainview, Baylor University.

Goodner, Representative W. B., Dublin, appointed by the Governor.

Graves, D. E., Gatesville, Baylor University.

Hornby, Representative H. P., Uvalde, appointed by the Governor.

James, Prof. H. G., Austin, University of Texas.

Jordan, Representative H. P., Waco, appointed by the Governor.

Mather, Prof. W. T., Austin, University of Texas.

Mayer, Henry P., Paris, appointed by the Mayor.

Morrow, Senator W. C., Hillsboro, appointed by the Governor.

Murray, Senator W. O., Floresville, appointed by the Governor.

Nicholson, B. F., San Antonio, appointed by the Mayor.

Nugent, Senator C. W., Conroe, appointed by the Governor.

Pennybacker, Mrs. Percy V., 2606 Whitis avenue, Austin, President of General Federation of Women's Clubs.

Pfeiffer, O. A., 2902 S. Presa street, San Antonio.

Phillips, Prof. W. B., Austin, University of Texas.

Potts, Prof. C. S., Austin, University of Texas.

Pryor, Hon. Ike T., San Antonio, appointed by the Mayor.

Reedy, Representative D. M., Tyler, appointed by the Governor.

Warren, Senator, R. L., Terrell, appointed by the Governor.

Way, W. T., San Antonio, appointed by the Mayor.

Webb, Judge J. E., San Antonio, appointed by the Mayor.

White, Hon. Byrd E., Dallas, Baylor University.

Wortham, Representative Louis J., Fort Worth, appointed by the Governor.

UTAH.

Bennion, S. O., 67 E. Temple street, Salt Lake City, appointed by the Governor.

Chamberlain, Joseph, Orderville, appointed by the Governor.

VIRGINIA.

Angell, R. H., Roanoke, appointed by the Mayor.

Campbell, R. S., Palmyra, appointed by the Governor.

Caton, James R., Alexandria, appointed by the Governor.

Cole, E. D., Fredericksburg, appointed by the Governor.

Deans, Park P., Windsor, appointed by the Governor.

Fleishman, Solomon W., Richmond, appointed by the Governor.

Goodloe, Mrs. E. E., Big Stone Gap, Virginia Federation of Women's Clubs.

Hacker, Rev. T. J., Roanoke, appointed by the Mayor.

Hagan, Mrs. John L., Danville, Virginia Federation of Women's Clubs.

Jett, T. A., Reedville, appointed by the Governor.

Johnson, L. E., Roanoke, appointed by the Mayor.

Kizer, Charles G., Norfolk, appointed by the Governor.

La Baume, Mrs. Lydia H., Roanoke, Virginia Federation of Women's Clubs.

Mundy, George P., Washington, D. C., appointed by the Governor of Virginia.

Ould, George, Evington, appointed by the Governor.

Putney, Mrs. E. W., Wytheville, Virginia Federation of Women's Clubs.

Seifert, S. P., Roanoke, appointed by the Mayor.

Smith, W. M., Cumberland Court House, appointed by the Governor.

Stone, E. L., Roanoke, appointed by the Mayor.

White, Miss Anne R., Librarian of Washington and Lee University, Lexington, Virginia Federation of Women's Clubs.

VERMONT.

Estee, Mrs. James B., Montpelier, Vermont Federation of Women's Clubs.

Evarts, Mrs. Sherman, Windsor, Vermont Federation of Women's Clubs.

Folsom, Mrs. Harley E., Lyndonville, Vermont Federation of Women's Clubs.

Graves, Mrs. Collins M., Bennington, Vermont Federation of Women's Clubs.

Smith, Mrs. Edward C., St. Albans, Vermont Federation of Women's Clubs.

Wasson, Mrs. Watson L., Waterbury, Vermont Federation of Women's Clubs.

WEST VIRGINIA.

- Applegate, Miss Mina, Hudson House, Wellsburg, West Virginia Federation of Women's Clubs.
- Franzheim, Mrs. H. C., Wheeling, West Virginia Federation of Women's Clubs.
- McNeilan, Mrs. Milton, 911 Market street, Parkersburg, West Virginia Federation of Women's Clubs.
- Waddell, Mrs. F. J., 1454 Third avenue, Huntington, West Virginia Federation of Women's Clubs.
- Watson, Mrs. George, Fairmont, West Virginia Federation of Women's Clubs.

WISCONSIN.

- Jeffrey, Charles T., Kenosha, appointed by the Mayor.
- Lochner, Louis P., 612 S. Brearly street, Madison, Corda Fratres, International Federation of Students and Wisconsin Peace Society.
- McLaren, Wm., Manager, Gilbel Bros., Milwaukee, Citizens' Business League.
- Mortimer, James D., President, Milwaukee Electric Railway & Light Co., Milwaukee, Citizens' Business League.
- O'Connor, W. P., Goodrich Transit Co., Milwaukee, Citizens' Business League.
- Reinsch, Paul S., 423 Wisconsin avenue, Madison, Wisconsin Peace Society, Wisconsin University.
- Robinson, H. B., Kenosha, appointed by the Mayor.
- Simmons, Z. G., Kenosha, appointed by the Mayor.
- Stone, Nat, President, Boston Store Co., Milwaukee, Citizens' Business League.
- Strong, W. W., Kenosha, appointed by the Mayor.
- Thiers, E. G., Kenosha, appointed by the Mayor.
- Vilter, Wm. O., Milwaukee, Citizens' Business League.
- Whitehead, Ex-Senator J. M., Janesville, Wisconsin Peace Society.

WYOMING.

- Blyth, Thomas, Evanston, appointed by the Governor.
- Blyth, Mrs. Thomas, Evanston.
- Bolln, Otto, Douglas, appointed by the Governor.
- Corthell, Nellis E., Laramie, appointed by the Governor.
- Cosgriff, T. A., Cheyenne, appointed by the Governor.
- Cunningham, A. J., Casper, appointed by the Governor.
- David, Edward T., Douglas, appointed by the Governor.
- Higby, A., Basin, appointed by the Governor.
- Johnston, E. S., Cheyenne, appointed by the Governor.
- Johnston, M. R., Chugwater, appointed by the Governor.
- Stone, Edward, Cheyenne, appointed by the Governor.

HAWAII.

Hidden, Edward N., Commonwealth Trust Co., St. Louis, appointed by the Governor of Hawaii.

Myrick, Stephen S., Manoa Valley, Honolulu, appointed by the Governor of Hawaii.

THE PHILIPPINES.

Quezon, Manuel S., Delegate from The Philippines, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

PORTO RICO.

Collazo, Domingo, 301 W. One Hundred and Fiftieth street, New York, representing Porto Rico.

O'Neill, Gonzalo, 100 William street, New York, representing Porto Rico.

(Foreign Countries)

BOLIVIA.

Calderon, Señor Don Ignacio, Washington, D. C., E. E. and M. P. of Bolivia.

BRAZIL.

de Figueiredo, Alfonso, 4118 McPherson avenue, St. Louis, Consul representing Brazil.

CHILE.

Cramer, F. Ernst, St. Louis, Consul, representing Chile.

COLOMBIA AND VENEZUELA.

Arbuckle, James, 314 N. Fourth street, St. Louis, Consul, representing Colombia and Venezuela.

COSTA RICA

Calvo, Joaquin Bernardo, 1329 Eighteenth street, Washington, D. C., E. E. and M. P. of Costa Rica.

DOMINION OF CANADA.

Lewis, John, Editor, The Star, Toronto.

Riddell, Justice William Renwick, Osgoode Hall, Toronto, University of Toronto.

Russell, Justice Benjamin, Halifax, N. S.

DOMINICAN REPUBLIC.

Peynado, Francisco J., 1532 Twenty-second street, Washington, D. C., E. E. and M. P. of the Dominican Republic.

ECUADOR.

Cordova, Gonzalo S., 2643 Broadway, New York City, Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of Ecuador, appointed by the Government of Ecuador.

Wither, S. S. S., Ninety-fourth and Broadway, New York City, Charge d'Affaires of Ecuador at Washington, representing the Government of Ecuador.

HONDURAS.

Membreno, Dr. Alberto, E. E. and M. P., Washington, D. C., representing the Government of Honduras.

GUATEMALA.

Kingsland, L. D., Hotel Beers, St. Louis, specially commissioned by the Government of Guatemala.

JAPAN.

Weakley, William R., Vice-President, American Peace Society in Japan.

MEXICO.

Mariscal, Alonso, primera Solidad 8, Mexico City, appointed by the Government of the United States of Mexico.

Pardo, Luis Lara, 529 W. One Hundred and Seventy-ninth street, New York City, appointed by the Government of the United States of Mexico.

Baz, Fernando, St. Louis, Consul of Mexico.

NICARAGUA.

Gutierrez, Rodolfo J., Washington, D. C., special representative of the Government of Nicaragua.

PANAMA.

Lefevre, J. E., The Portland, Washington, D. C., representing the Republic of Panama.

PERU.

Pezet, Hon. F. A., Washington, D. C., E. E. and M. P. of Peru.

EXTRACTS FROM LETTERS*

You may use my name as Vice-President of the Congress.

CHAMP CLARK.

All I can do is to express my sincere good wishes for the success of the Congress, and of the admirable cause which engages your disinterested efforts.

JAMES BRYCE.

I am greatly in favor of the objects of the Congress and hope it will be a great success.

JOSEPH H. CHOATE.

As I myself was President of the Third American Peace Congress, which was held at Baltimore, there is nothing more I would like to do than attend this meeting.

HAMILTON HOLT.

It would give me the greatest pleasure to accept the invitation, were it possible, but on account of the work of the Court, I shall not be able to visit St. Louis at that time.

CHARLES E. HUGHES.

No one is a more earnest advocate of peace than I, but I am not a ready speaker.

JOHN CLAFLIN.

I wish for your Congress a most successful session.

WILLIAM H. TAFT.

I beg to acknowledge receipt of your favor, inviting me to serve as one of the Vice-Presidents of the Congress. It will give me pleasure to accept.

OSCAR S. STRAUSS.

I hope that this Congress will realize the high aims set for it.

ROBERT BACON.

It would afford me great pleasure to accept this invitation and to prepare the discourse suggested upon The Hague Tribunal, if it were possible for me to be in the United States at that time.

DAVID JAYNE HILL.

If anything could change my arrangements your words certainly would induce me to accept the invitation to speak before your Peace Congress.

EMIL G. HIRSCH.

It is a great disappointment to us both not to be able to attend.

MR. AND MRS. CHARLES HENROTIN.

It is a subject in which I am deeply interested. I have all my life been a peace man. My father and mother were Quakers. I shall try to be at the meeting in St. Louis.

ARTHUR CAPPER.

It would give me great pleasure to act on your committee if I could attend the Peace Congress.

THOMAS NELSON PAGE.

* Hundreds of letters expressing interest and sympathy in the Peace Movement were received from those unable to be present.

INDEX

A

A Century of Anglo-American Peace, 416.
 "Active Promotion of Industrial Peace as a Primary Policy of the United States," Reinsch, 333.
 Adequate Defense, Issue of, 214.
 Ainev, Hon. William D. B., Address, 228.
 Alabama Controversy, 420.
 "America's Obligation," Debardleben, 262.
 American Peace and Arbitration League, 239.
 American Peace Society, Annual Meeting, 527.
 American Peace Society, Work of, 116.
 American School Peace League, 68.
 American Students at German Universities, 344.
 "An Efficient Peace Society," Hull, 125.
 Andrews, Fannie Fern, Address, 73.
 Andrews, Fannie Fern, Address, 207.
 "Anglo-American Obligations in Maintaining Peace," Russell, 417.
 Anglo-American Peace Centennial, 424.
 "Appreciation of the Waste of War," Jordan, 571.
 Aristophanes' Drama of Peace, 308.
 Army Estimates for 1913, 90.
 Army League of America, 376.
 Army of Moscow, 402.
 A Soul's Tragedy, 298.
 Association for International Interchange of Students, 199.
 "Assurance of Peace," Welsh, 249.
 Atterbury, Rev. S. A., Advisory Board, 362.
 Automobile Tour, 364.

B

Balkan War, 428.
 Bartholdt, Richard, President of the Congress, 101.
 "Baseless Fear of War," Andrew Carnegie, 88.
 Beals, Charles E., Address, 114.
 Beals, Charles E., Address, 173.
 "Better Way," Claxton, 387.
 Birkhead, Frank R., Oration, 55.
 Bitting, Rev. Dr. W. C., Resolution, 359.
 Black, Mrs. Elmer, Address, 485.
 Blewett, Ben, Presiding, 68.
 Borden, Prime Minister of Canada, 195.
 Brant, Rev. Otho, on Peace, 241.
 British Capture of Washington, 447.
 Brookings, R. S., Director American Peace Society, 358.
 Bryan Arbitration Plan, 358.
 Buffalo Expedition, 445.
 "Burden of the Nations," Green, 545.
 Burton, Hon. Theodore E., Presiding, 416.
 Burton, Hon. Theodore E., Address, 526.

C

Cabell, Ashley, Oratorical Contest, 28.
 Cabell, Mrs. Ashley, Advisory Board, 362.
 Calderon, Minister of Bolivia, Address, 160.
 Call, Arthur Deerin, Address, 116.
 Call, Arthur Deerin, Peace Movement 1815-1913, 11.
 Canada's Message, Borden, 195.
 Canadian Loyalty, 449.
 Carnegie, Andrew, Address, 88.
 Carnegie, Andrew, Presiding, 399.
 Carnegie Endowment, 209.
 Century of Anglo-American Peace, A," 416.
 China and the U. S. Constitution, 284.
 Choate, Joseph H., on the Navy, 234.
 "Christianity and World Peace," Mathews, 366.
 Christ in the Andes, Story of, 221.
 Claxton, Hon. Philander P., Address, 387.
 Colorado Greetings, 339.
 Committees of the Congress, 580.
 Congressional Appropriations, 466.
 Corda Fratres, 201.
 Cosmopolitan Clubs, 201.
 Council of the National Defense, 237.
 Court of Arbitral Justice, 327.

D

Dadman, Arthur Henry, Address, 234.
 Dalton, Sidna Poage, Oration, 33.
 Debardleben, J. Arthur, Oration, 262.
 Delegates Enrolled, 586.
 "Demand for International Peace," Dalton, 33.
 "Demand for Peace," Mitchell, 533.
 "Democracy and Peace," Black, 485.
 Denmark and Disarmament, 312.

E

"Educational and International Peace," Washington, 309.
 "Education for Rational Internationalism," Thwing, 69.
 "Effective Follow-up Work," Root, 137.
 Efficient Peace Society, An," Hull, 125.
 Eighth International Congress, Cosmopolitan Clubs, 205.
 Eighty Arbitration Treaties, 97.
 Eleventh Commandment, 215.
 Elliot, E. C., Presiding, 461.
 England's War Loan, 408.
 "Enlargement of Membership in Peace Societies," Hall, 131.
 "Eternal Peace," Kant, 340.
 "Ethics of War," Hudson, 410.
 "Ethnic Factors of International Problems," Parmelee, 495.

F

- "Facts Relating to the Field," Call, 116.
 Fairbanks, Hon. Charles W., Address, 281.
 Fairbanks, Hon. Charles W., Presiding, 365.
 Feudal and Modern Japan, 404.
 Fifth American Peace Congress, 435.
 "Fifty-four Forty or Fight," 454.
 First General Session, 81.
 Fliske, John, on Peace, 237.
 Foreign Delegates and Visitors, 635.
 Foreword on the Program Hudson, 16.
 "From Chaos to Harmony," Stuckey, 271.
 "From Junglism to Internationalism," Beals, 172.

G

- Garden Party, 364.
 Germany's War Losses, 405.
 Gill, Laura Drake, Address, 291.
 Glennon, Archbishop John J., Address, 63.
 Goddard, Leroy A., Presiding, 506.
 "Gospel of Peace," Glennon, 63.
 Gospel of the New Mothers, 303.
 Grant on War, 414.
 Grant's Proudest Achievements, 301.
 Green, Thomas E., Address, 545.
 Greetings from Guatemala, Kingsland, 196.
 Greetings from Mexico, Mariscal, 490.
 Grossman, E. M., Oratorical Contest, 28.

H

- "Hague Tribunal, Present Meaning and Future Promise," Hull, 315.
 Hall, Chancellor F. A., Presiding, 279.
 Hall, J. J., Address, 131.
 Hart, W. O., Invitation from New Orleans, 541.
 Hay-Pauncefote Treaty, 287.
 Heroes of Peace, 257.
 Heroism of Commander Scott, 307.
 Hero of the Prairie Belle, 305.
 Hidden, Edward, Oratorical Contest, 28.
 Hill, John Wesley, Address, 379.
 Hobson's Japanese Prediction, 338.
 "How Can We Show Our Good Faith in the Peace Movement," Richard, 476.
 "How War Effects Business," Levering, 516.
 Hudson, Manley O., Foreword on the Program, 16.
 Hudson, Manley O., Report of, 354.
 Hudson, Prof. William J., Address, 410.
 Hugo, Victor, on Peace, 88.
 Hull, William I., Address, 315.
 Hull, William I., Presiding, 494.
 Humphrey, A. B., Peace and Arbitration League, 141.
 Hunt, Harry E., Great Lakes Society, 151.

I

- "Identity of Interests of the United States and Canada," Lewis, 425.
 Immediate Issues and Future Aims, 365.
 "Immediate Issues and Public Sentiment," Mead, 373.
 Inevitability of Peace, 279.

- Initial Movement of First Hague Conference, 97.
 "Intellectual and Moral Disarmament," Ainey, 228.
 Inter-American Relations, Section Meeting, 159.
 Intercollegiate Peace Association, 26.
 Intercollegiate Peace Association Prizes, 49.
 International Clubs, 344.
 International Conciliation, Lectures, 210.
 International Council of Education, 78.
 "International Credit and War," Schmidlapp, 522.
 "International Law of Airships," Usher, 461.
 "International Peace," Tierney, 37.
 International Peace Through International Law, 461.
 "Internationalism Among Universities," Lochner, 197.
 Interstate Oratorical Contest, 248.
 Introductory Notes, 7.
 Invocation, Bishop Daniel S. Tuttle, 83.
 Invocation, Rev. Dr. S. J. Nicholls, 397.
 "The Isthmus," Lefevre, 169.

J

- Japan Scare, 94.
 Japanese Association Message, 366.
 Jingoism, Warning of General Miles, 90.
 Jones, Jenkin Lloyd, Address, 218.
 Jones, Jenkin Lloyd, Address, 296.
 Jordan, David Starr, Address, 400.
 Jordan, David Starr, Address, 571.
 "Justice and Honor of Nations," Tuschmidt, 44.

K

- Kiel, Mayor Henry W., Address, 87.

L

- "Lay Down Your Arms," McFaden, 14.
 League of South American Students, 203.
 Lee, Robert E., College President, 301.
 Lefevre, J. E., Panama Address, 169.
 Levering, Eugene, Address, 516.
 Lewis, John, Address, 425.
 Lieber's Code of War, 343.
 Lochner, Louis P., Address, 197.
 Loeb, Isidor, Presiding, 197.

M

- McFaden, Mildred, Poem, 14.
 Major, Gov. Elliott W., Address, 84.
 "Manhood and War," Jordan, 400.
 Mariscal, Senor Alonso, Address, 490.
 Mass Meeting, Address, Andrew Carnegie, 399.
 Mathews, Dean Shaller, Address, 366.
 Maurice on War, 413.
 Mead, Edwin D., Address, 340.
 Mead, Edwin D., Remarks, 147.
 Mead, Mrs. Lucia Ames, Address, 373.
 Message from President Wilson, 6.
 Message of President of China, 349.
 " Militarism and the Average Citizen," Rogers, 464.
 The Militarist Challenge, 464.
 Military Activities, German and French, 474.

"Mills of Industry on the Trail of Mars," Root, 507.
 Missouri Oratorical Contest, 28.
 Missouri Peace Society, Annual Meeting, 350.
 Mitchell, S. C., Oratorical Contest, 248.
 Moore, Mrs. Philip N., Discussion, 145.
 Muench, Hugo, Oratorical Contest, 248.
 "Mutual Confidence and Respect as a Basis for Peace Between Nations," Pezet, 164.
 Myer, Philip Van Ness, Address, 214.

N

Napoleon's Campaigns, 403.
 Nash, Edward Vernon, Oration, 49.
 Navy General Board Recommendations, 469.
 "Navy League," Dadman, 234.
 "New Conscience," Myer, 214.
 "New Nobility," Sherman, 266.
 "New Patriotism," Wickens, 254.

O

Officers of the Congress, 2.
 "One Hundred Years Ago," Riddell, 443.
 "One Hundred Years of Peace," Tryon, 458.
 Opium Traffic in China, 442.
 "Organization Work in Public Schools," Andrews, 73.
 Osborne, Navy League, 241.
 Otting, Very Reverend Bernard J., 62.
 "Our International Opportunity," Calderon, 160.
 "Our National Duty," Fairbanks, 281.
 "Our Relation to Peace," Nash, 49.
 Outlook for Peace Throughout the World, 544.

P

Panama Canal Fortification, 91.
 Panama Canal Tolls, 285.
 Pan-American Conference of 1890, 339.
 "Pan-Teutonic Pledge of Peace," Mead, 340.
 Parmelee, Prof. Maurice, Address, 495.
 Peace and Arbitration Committee of Colorado, 339.
 Peace Flag, 442.
 "Peace Movement, 1815-1913," Call, 11.
 "Peace, Not War, the School of Heroism," Jones, 296.
 "Peace Pageants," Pennybacker, 566.
 Peace Policy of Emperor William, 348.
 Pennybacker, Mrs. Percy V., Address, 566.
 Permanent Court of Arbitration, 326.
 Pezet, Minister for Peru, Address, 165.
 Platform of the Congress, 439.
 Preliminary Meetings, 27.
 "Present Demands of the Peace Movement," Trueblood, 106.
 President of the Congress, Address, 101.
 Problems of the Hague Conference, 314.
 Program of the Congress, 17.
 "Progress of the Peace Movement Through Education," Andrews, 207.
 Promotion of International Peace, Section, 114.

R

Reception at Wednesday Club, 277.
 Red Cross Society, 402.
 Regimental Water Carrier, 304.
 Reinsch, Professor Paul S., Address, 333.
 Relations of Business and International Peace, 506.
 Republic of China, Congratulations, 349.
 Resolutions, Committee on, 112.
 Richard, Dr. Ernst, Address, 243.
 Richard, Dr. Ernst, Address, 476.
 Riddell, William Renwick, Address, 443.
 Rogers, Dr. William P., Address, 464.
 Root, Robert C., Address, 137.
 Root, Robert C., Address, 507.
 Russell, Benjamin, Address, 417.

S

St. Louis University Peace Exercises, 62.
 Salisbury, Marquis of, on Military Advice, 96.
 San Francisco Invitation for 1915, 436.
 Santiago Bay, Story of, 225.
 Schmidlapp, Jacob G., Address, 522.
 Science and International Peace, 494.
 Scott, Dr. James Brown, Presiding, 314.
 Self-Conquerors, the Real Conquerors, 300.
 Sherman, John Walter, Oration, 266.
 Sherman on War, 415.
 Smith, James E., Opening Address, 81.
 "Some Experiences in Peace Work," Beals, 114.
 "Some Racial Bearings of War," Gill, 291.
 Spencer, Selden P., Presiding, 28.
 Sprague, Ruth H., Greetings, 339.
 Story of Bradley Benson, 303.
 Story of Conductor Bradley, 305.
 Stuckey, Lewis J., Oration, 271.
 Sumner, Charles, on Cost of War, 43.
 Supreme Court of Nations, 317.
 Supreme Work of America, 260.
 Symposium on Disarmament, 214.

T

Table of Contents, 4.
 Taxation for Armament, Lloyd George, 39.
 "They, Too, Are Brothers," Willson, 28.
 Third Hague Conference and the Czar, 239.
 Third Peace Congress at the Hague, 331.
 "Three Steps of Disarmament," Jones, 218.
 Three Teutonic Nations, 346.
 Thwing, Charles F., Address, 69.
 Thwing, Charles F., Presiding, 248.
 Tierney, John Leo, Oration, 37.
 Tierney, John Leo, Oration, 261.
 Tribute to Secretary Hudson, 362.
 Trueblood, Dr. Benjamin F., Address, 106.
 Trueblood, Dr. Benjamin F., Presiding, 464.
 Tryon, James L., Oratorical Contest, 248.
 Tryon, James L., Stereopticon Lecture, 458.

Tuchschmidt, Arnold J., Oration, 44.
 Tuttle, Bishop Daniel S., Invocation, 83.

U

United Empire Loyalists, 448.
 "United States and Japan," Hill, 37.
 United States a World Power, 282.
 Universities and the Peace Movement, 197.
 Usher, Prof. Roland G., Address, 461.
 Usher, Prof. Roland G., Presiding, 215.

W

War of 1812, 443.
 "War, the Sum of Wretchedness," Birkhead, 55.
 Warren, Mrs. William E., Oratorical Contest, 248.
 Washington, Booker T., Address, 309.
 Weatherley, Arthur L., Nebraska Society, 149.
 Welcome to St. Louis, Mayor Kiel, 87.

Welcome to Missouri, Governor Major, 84.

Welsh, Vernon W., Oration, 249.
 Werner, Percy, Oratorical Contest, 248.
 Weston, Professor Stephen F., 26.
 "What is War?" Bacon, 38.
 Whittier on Peace, 54.
 Wickens, D. L., Oration, 254.
 Williamson, Rev. Dr. W. J., Remarks, 398.
 Wilson, G. C., Oration, 28.
 Women's Influence for Peace, 227.
 Women's Special Contribution to Society, 293.
 "Work of a State Peace Society," Call, 350.

Y

Yamato, Japan, Peace, 384.
 Young People's Christian Federation, 397.

Z

Zones for Aircraft, 463.



RETURN TO the circulation desk of any
University of California Library
or to the
NORTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY
Bldg. 400, Richmond Field Station
University of California
Richmond, CA 94804-4698

ALL BOOKS MAY BE RECALLED AFTER 7 DAYS

- 2-month loans may be renewed by calling
(510) 642-6753
- 1-year loans may be recharged by bringing
books to NRLF
- Renewals and recharges may be made 4
days prior to due date.

DUE AS STAMPED BELOW

SEP 08 1998

12,000 (11/95)

LD 21A-60m-10,'65
(F7763s10)476B

General Library
University of California
Berkeley

279436

National

JX 1932

.A5

1913

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA LIBRARY

